THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IX DECEMBER, 1924 No. 54

EDITORIAL

The close of 1924 finds Europe in a more hopeful position as regards the recovery of moral and economic equilibrium than at any time since the Armistice. The issue, and subsequent application, of the Dawes Scheme synchronized with the emergence of a changed temper, both in governments and peoples; and the Christmas message of Peace and Good-will will not seem, as it so often has in recent years, to be a powerless voice crying in the wilderness. This does not mean that the aftermath of war is yet all reaped. Thousands of refugees in Greece still appeal for anything we can give to buy them food or to keep them clothed;* while the long tale of unemployed at home bears witness to a world still out of joint. Nevertheless, there is a growing confidence. Sober counsels have been seen to prevail, and, in prevailing, to dissipate many suspicions and misunderstandings. Even in France—so *The Times* correspondent assures us—the impulse in Government circles to revert to the policy of attacking the Church is being brought up short against the necessity of floating an internal loan, and the difficulty of doing so without the support of Catholic opinion. And meanwhile the cause of Christian Reunion steadily gains ground. The first ebb after the high-water-mark of the Lambeth Appeal has spent itself; and the tide of resolve and hope and prayer is setting again towards unity.

We cannot refrain from a brief word of tribute to the memory of the late Bishop of Zanzibar, who was an occasional contributor to this journal. Faithful and fearless as a missionary, learned and penetrating as a theologian, beloved as a Bishop, he has laid down his life among his African people; and they and we alike mourn his loss. *Requiescat in pace.*

* Imperial War Relief Fund, 26, Gordon Street, Gordon Square, London, W.C. 1.

THE GOSPEL OF LIFE: A STUDY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

VI.—THE DIVINE CLAIM

We have left our Lord in Galilee.* The scene now changes back to Jerusalem. During the year between the Passover of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Passover of the Passion He is represented as paying two visits to Jerusalem, one at the Feast of Tabernacles, one at the Feast of Dedication. Here we have the visit at the Feast of Tabernacles.

It was *the* feast of the Jews, when they gathered from all parts of the country. It is a mixed crowd in the midst of which we find ourselves. Galilee and Jerusalem are met together. There are shifting currents of feeling and opinion. There are voices crying this way and that, impulses of faith and checks of doubt, whispers and cries. It is a dramatic picture of a varied scene. In the background all the time looms the threatening antagonism of the Jews. And He appears in the midst, sometimes addressing Himself to the Jews, sometimes to the Galileans, sometimes addressing Himself to the one and answered by the other, sometimes breaking forth into an utterance of the Gospel of Life addressed to all alike.

His main underlying purpose seems to be to insist on their responsibility in rejecting His message, and this responsibility would be shared by the nation as a whole. He keeps telling them that He comes from another world, and goes to another world. "I am not come of Myself, but He that sent Me is true, whom ye know not." "Yet a little while am I with you, and I go unto Him that sent Me. Ye shall seek Me and shall not find Me, and where I am ye cannot come." There grows upon us the sense of a great contrast, a yawning gulf. On the one side that eternal world from which He comes, to which He goes. On the other the blinded hearts, the shifting voices, the conflicting doubts, of those among whom He moves. On the one hand, "Is not this He whom they seek to kill?" "Do they know that this is indeed the Christ? Howbeit we know this man whence He is. When Christ cometh no one knoweth whence He is." "This is of a truth the Prophet." "This is the

* The story opens with "After these things our Lord went on walking in Galilee." Speaking from the Jerusalem point of view the Evangelist uses "Galilee" in the sense which would be natural—*i.e.*, the term covers all the districts included in Herod's jurisdiction, on the east as well as on the west side of the Lake, and the northern country which would be spoken of as "Galilee" in contrast to Jerusalem. In St. Mark ix. 30 "Galilee" is used in a more restricted sense of the populous district west of the Lake, which had been the main scene of His ministry.

Christ." "What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David and from Bethlehem?" On the other, His calm and deliberate claim, "I know whence I came and whither I go."

There seems to be a strange and unearthly power in His words. "They sought to take Him, and no man laid hands on Him." They sent officers to take Him, and when they ask, "Why did ye not bring Him?" they say, "Never man so spake." "These words spake He in the treasury as He taught in the Temple and no man took Him."

It is into the midst of the same tossing sea of questions and doubts that there flash out the great revealing utterances of the Gospel of Life. At the pouring of the water in memory of the striking of the rock in the wilderness, "If any man thirst let him come unto Me and drink. Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water." There follows on the utterance once more the expression of the various shades of feeling among His hearers. There was a division in the multitude. Some would have taken Him. But the officers return without having fulfilled their mission. Again, at the lighting of the great lights in memory of the Light that guided them in the wilderness, "I am the Light of the world. He that followeth Me shall have the light of life." He is met by the Jews with the old objection that He bears witness of Himself. He tells them that He has the witness of His Father who is with Him. The storm-clouds seem to gather. The darkness deepens. The light reveals it, the inevitable condemnation of the light. It seems as though their unbelief made the urgency of His consciousness of His divine mission more imperative. It finds struggling almost reluctant utterance in words of ambiguous meaning. The blindness of their rejection compels the revelation of their awful responsibility. "Ye are from beneath; I am from above. Ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you that ye shall die in your sins. Except ye believe that I am, ye shall die in your sins."

Sometimes His words seem to have a strange power over the hearers. The words themselves do not seem to account for it. There was a majesty in His utterance before which the souls of men were bowed to at least a temporary allegiance. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man then shall ye know that I am, and that I do nothing of Myself, but as the Father hath taught Me I speak these things." "And He that sent Me is with Me. He hath not left Me alone, for I do always the things that are pleasing to Him." As He spake these things many believed on Him. Was it the mysterious reference to His exaltation, or the calm confidence of His claim of constant communion with

the Father that won them to at least a momentary faith ? Their professed belief calls forth a new promise, a promise which was a test of the reality of their belief. " If ye abide in My word, then are ye truly My disciples, and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free "; no longer the slaves of sin, free with the freedom of the Son.

Children of Abraham, they protest that they need no gift of freedom. Their resentment at the offer to make free those who, as children of Abraham, claimed to be free by right, carries the would-be believers over in our Lord's rapid judgment to the side of His antagonists. He had shrunk from coming up to Jerusalem because the Jews sought to kill him. In referring (vii. 21) to the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath day, the original cause why they sought to kill Him, He had already spoken of the purpose of the rulers as one for which the nation in general were responsible. Now He definitely identifies with their purpose those who, by resenting His offer, had passed over to His enemies. It is as though throughout He saw the deadly antagonism between the Divine purpose of His Mission and the temper of those among whom He moved. Light and darkness are meeting in no ambiguous shade between the two. The white light of the Divine Presence flashes into the midst of the impenetrable darkness of a world of sin. There are no half lights.

" Children of Abraham "! and they were seeking to kill Him, a man that had told them the truth which He heard from God. They do the works of their Father, not God, from whom He comes, whose word they cannot understand—their father is the devil, who inspires their purpose of murder, and has no truth in him. " Because I say the truth ye believe Me not." They do not hear His words because they are not of God.

His relentless confidence only seems to them to put Him outside the pale, even the pale of reason. " Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." It seems the more wonderful that our Lord should still press the issue and take even higher ground. He must declare the truth whether they would hear or whether they would forbear. " I honour My Father. I seek not Mine own glory. There is one that seeketh and judgeth. The judgment of God will be shown as the judgment of the giver of life. If a man keep My saying he shall never see death."

Still more He seems to them possessed. Is He greater than Abraham who is dead, that He claims to give to men never to taste of death ?

He answers as before, that His claim is not His own. It is God, whom they know not, that glorifies Him with a glory that Abraham rejoiced to see.

Does He claim, then, to have seen Abraham? His answer claims for Him the ineffable Name of the Eternal God. Before Abraham was I am. In Him they are face to face with the Eternal.

The steps by which the advance has been made to this final revelation have been first tentative, almost hesitating, then rapid and abrupt. And the record leaves us, at every reading of it, almost incredulous that it should have been written.

What, then, in substance does it profess to tell us? We are to set before ourselves Him who was in very truth Eternal God face to face with His own, who should have welcomed His offer of eternal life, the present manifestation of the Eternal God, driven by their obstinately undiscerning rejection of His offer to manifest the awful truth that in rejecting Him they were rejecting God.

It is hopeless to attempt to make such a record intelligible on any assumption inspired by our ordinary reading of the Galilean records—such an assumption as that with which we habitually and instinctively approach the Johannine story. There the Divine character of the central figure of the story breaks through as the picture grows of One who is seen to claim a more than human pre-eminence, sinless and forgiving sin. Here the claim to give eternal life, implicit in the Galilean ministry, is from the first in the foreground of the picture, and the truth that underlies it, the eternal character of Him who makes the claim, is constantly revealing itself as ever present in his mind, and as more and more manifest in His words. Finally, it becomes definitely explicit as a revelation of judgment, a lightning flash of revelation, a claim justifying itself by the humility and love which are part and parcel of its very substance, but condemning by the sheer majesty of the eternal truth the blindness of those who have refused to see. The purpose of the ministry at Jerusalem is the Divine offer of life. There underlies it in the background the claim of Him who makes it to be Himself Divine. Here, at the Feast of Tabernacles, the two elements appear separate and side by side. The Jews have already virtually rejected the offer of life. It remains imperative on Him to declare, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, that in rejecting the offer they are rejecting God Himself.

The sheer authority of God stands always in the background of the religion of the Jew. Here it inevitably forces itself to the front. And to manifest the truth, that in rejecting Him they were rejecting the Eternal God, He is bound to make the final revelation precise that He who claims to manifest the Eternal God is Himself God Eternal.

WILFRID RICHMOND.

OUR APPEAL TO HISTORY*

I. SINCE Christianity is a historical religion, all Christians must in some sense make their appeal to history. That Jesus Christ lived and taught and died in Judæa during the reign of Tiberius "under Pontius Pilate," and that His life here among men was of unique religious significance, is common ground to everyone who calls himself, in however loose an acceptation of the term, a Christian; and therefore the facts of His life and the documents which are the source of our knowledge of His teaching must be to all Christians a matter of primary concern.

Still, it remains true that the appeal to history—though no Christian can avoid it altogether—has been, in fact, characteristic of certain types of Christian thought and certain communities of Christians; and in particular it has been during more than three centuries a distinguishing mark of the Church of England.

The Protestant rigidly limited his historical appeal to the contents of the New Testament. He drew an arbitrary line somewhere about A.D. 100, and rejected all that lay between that time and the Reformation. But when he accepted the New Testament as it stood, he was accepting a collection made by the Christian Church, and the Church did not, by the act of propounding the New Testament, cease to exist. It existed equally both before and after the existence and recognition of the New Testament.

The Ultramontane from opposite premisses arrived at an even more drastic conclusion. The whole of the story that has unfolded itself since Pentecost is, in his sense, past and done with, for if you have an infallible guide, you have neither the need nor the right to test and verify his interpretation of the tradition of the Church. "The appeal to history is treason."

Within the Church of England itself the appeal to history had, a hundred years ago, become almost dormant. It is just a hundred years since Newman was elected to a Fellowship at Oriel; Keble was a Fellow already, Pusey became one a little later. When a decade later the Oxford movement was launched into being with the *Tracts for the Times*, it was the prime business of the Tract writers not to invent, but to restate the case for the Church of England on the basis of the witness of the undivided Church. The appeal was to history. On the one hand, the evidence of the New Testament could not be divorced from the history of the community in and for which the New Testament books were written. On the other hand, the teaching of the Church to-day must be tested by its agreement with the

* This article is based on a paper read at the Norwich Anglo-Catholic Congress, October 18, 1922.

teaching of the Church of the Apostles and of the generations which followed.

For nearly a hundred years the movement has been at work. It has profoundly affected the Church of England, it may not unjustly be said to have transformed it. And the appeal to history has been maintained all along; and we could not conceive of the Oxford or Tractarian movement as continuing to exist without it.

But no movement of thought, Christian or not, can be prolonged over a period of three generations without experiencing real if subtle modifications. Our appeal to-day is in substance the same as the appeal of our immediate forefathers in the faith; but it would be idle to deny that time has wrought changes in outlook and method. Nay, the very work of the pioneers of the movement has itself corrected and enlarged our ideas.

When the movement began, historical criticism barely existed among us. The French Benedictines of St. Maur had dealt successfully on critical lines with a large mass of patristic literature. They were giants in their day, and we still read St. Athanasius and St. Basil, and for the most part St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, in texts produced by them two centuries ago. But the impetus they gave was exhausted by the middle of the eighteenth century. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* inaugurated, as Newman recognised,* a new epoch in the writing of Church history: but Gibbon stood alone—not to say that it was especially in his treatment of Christianity and the Church that prejudice had clouded his judgment. The scholars of the movement had to break new ground. Their business was not to be critics: their aim was not merely intellectual: but they were serious and thorough in all they did, and they took nothing at second hand. They read and thought before they wrote, and not only did the mass of their published work form a very solid contribution to the better knowledge of the primitive Church, but the new interest they aroused in Church history contributed, doubtless more than they were aware of or intended, to the furtherance of the new science of historical criticism. And one crucial weapon in our modern historical equipment was forged in the workshops of the movement itself at the moment of the crisis that rent and threatened to destroy it.

In lesser hands it had been possible so to state the appeal to history that it became something like a mechanical balancing of names and authorities. Even as employed by so great a master of learning as Dr. Pusey, it might seem to some minds

* *Essay on Development*, Introduction, p. 5: "It is melancholy to say it, but the chief, perhaps the only English writer who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the infidel Gibbon."

to over-emphasise the static at the expense of the dynamic element in the Christian society. Such would feel, since the Church of Christ is first and foremost a living organism, that it must have within it the capacity to outgrow the swaddling-clothes of its infancy. That conviction came to dominate the master mind of the movement. Against a stiff and rigid formulation of the appeal to primitive example, Newman set the principle of development.

The *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* was written in 1845. It was the justification of its author's passage to the Roman Church. Its intention was to turn the edge of just that appeal to history which the movement had set out to make. It is by far the most effective weapon which has been forged for this purpose. In a sense and within limits the argument is unanswerable. The conception of development has come to stay. All historical evaluation of the progress of Christianity must reckon with it: and since it would be puerile to deny, for instance, that development has taken place between the Christology of the first chapters of Acts and the Christology of the Council of Nicæa, it is only if development in some sense and in some sort is justifiable that we can defend the Catholic Creeds as the rightful interpretation of the Gospel. Must we conclude that the Anglican appeal to history is therefore evacuated of its force, and that, the idea of development once accepted, we must "follow it where it leads" to Rome? Or is it still open to us to restate the appeal to history in a form compatible with the idea of organic growth?

Let me say in the first place that Newman's genius shows itself far more in the conception of the principle than in its application to the facts. The historical part of the book reveals the weaker side of his mind: it is at times over-subtle, fanciful, sometimes almost wayward. If anyone wants an instance, let him look at the passage on development in connection with Christology, and note the way in which the cultus of the saints is dragged into the argument.* And in the second place, let me point out that if the acceptance of the principle of development implies a certain measure of restatement of the older Anglican appeal to history, we are not the only people affected. The old Protestant and Ultramontane conceptions alike are not only modified, they are undermined. What of the idea of the New Testament as an isolated unit, independent of its setting in history? If development means anything, that idea has gone, not to return. What of the Ultramontane

* I am referring to the original book. In later life Newman rearranged the book so completely that reference to any of the later editions is useless for the purpose of consulting the epoch-making volume of 1845.

scorn of history? It is experiencing, slowly but surely, the same fate.

II. If we believe (and I think that we shall all here agree in the belief) that no reunion of Christians would be worth the name which left out of account the communion of Rome, then we shall welcome, eagerly and thankfully, any signs of the emergence of a new spirit in the Roman Church of to-day. We do not in fact any longer hear that the appeal to history is treason. Historical and Biblical studies are pursued on critical principles as well within the Roman Church as without. Catholic Italy no doubt lags behind Catholic France and Germany. Duchesne's great work, the *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, would hardy have been put on the Index if it had not been translated into Italian: the fourth volume, for which we have looked so anxiously and so long, will, it is believed, appear posthumously, though, for the sparing of susceptibilities, not as volume iv. of the *Histoire Ancienne*, but with a separate title as an independent work. The new Benedictine text of St. Jerome's Vulgate Bible will be constructed in entire independence of the official text of Pope Clement VIII. A learned Jesuit at Rome is translating the Bible into the Italian vernacular. It would be wrong to exaggerate the importance of such things. Experience, bitter experience, has taught us that we must above all things keep our sense of proportion. But it is, at any rate, no longer true, as it was true not so very long ago, that "un vent désastreux souffle de Rome sur tout ce qui pense et travaille dans les pays catholiques." And quite lately the sacred College has elected to the apostolic throne in Pius XI. a scholar as learned as he is charitable and holy. May a divided Christendom receive a new inspiration to unity from his efforts.

The appeal to history, then, possesses not a diminishing, but an increasing value to-day. It is becoming common ground to the Roman and the Anglican scholar; we are beginning to think and talk in categories intelligible to one another. That does not yet, by a long way, spell agreement. We Anglicans cannot regard anything as true development in which we find fundamental inconsistency between the two terms of the process. If that is no longer present in the end which was present and characteristic in the beginning, there is something wrong somewhere.

Now it would not be in place here to discuss any particular dogma of the Roman Church; what is in my mind is rather the underlying and what may seem ingrained temper and spirit. I do not see how any honest inquirer can read and judge the New Testament as a whole without being conscious that an

atmosphere of freedom was one of the essential constituents of the life of the Apostolic Church; not the only constituent, of course, but a constituent and an essential one. This freedom was not merely a negative freedom from the shackles of the Law; it was something positive. Each member of the body has his part and function, without which the other members fail of their completeness; and if he must not work out his part in isolation from the rest, neither must they impose on him such limitations as to deprive him of all initiative. But this mark of the Christian fellowship, as the New Testament represents it, the Roman Church has to all appearance lost. We may well believe that the famous boast of Cardinal Bonnechose, "I say to my clergy, 'March,' and they march," would be translated into less autocratic language to-day. Yet the subordination of laity to clergy, clergy to bishops, bishops to pope, even if interpreted more liberally than by the French prelate, can hardly by any stretch of charity be brought into harmonious relations with the ideal drawn for us in the Apostolic Age.

III. But again, and on the other side, do we not totally misunderstand the New Testament if we fail to realize the emphasis—side by side with this freedom—on the Society, the outward and visible unity of the disciples? No Christian lived to himself. If ἀγάπη was a new coinage of Christianity, it* was not merely love to God, but love to fellow-men, and specially to fellow-Christians: "See how these Christians love one another." The much-quoted saying: "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them,"† is the charter of *societas*, not of separatism. No text in the New Testament is more misunderstood and misapplied; nine times out of ten it is cited in the interests of a small community as against a larger one, whereas, in fact, the context shows quite conclusively that it is an exhortation to Christians not to live apart, but together. Even if not more than two or three can be found in the neighbourhood, they are to meet; a promise is made to those who are gathered together, however few, in the Name of Christ that is not made to the Christian who keeps to himself. Expelled from the synagogue, the society of the Old Israel, the disciples were to realize and express in action, even if only on the smallest scale, the fellowship of the New Israel.

Is it too much to say that here once more we may thankfully reckon that a great gain has accrued to us during the last generation? The dominant Protestantism of the nineteenth

* The word is found sporadically in the LXX: but it is in the New Testament that it suddenly comes to the forefront.

† Matt. xviii. 20.

century had concentrated its emphasis on Christian freedom to the neglect of other elements of New Testament Christianity. It had little belief in, or use for, the visible society of the disciples. It was individualist to the core. Naturally, therefore, it would regard Church history as a growth that was poisoned from the root, a process of continual down-grade, because its very existence was a deflection from the ideal of Christ. But now, just as in Roman circles the door is no longer slammed on the appeal to history, so it seems to be more and more recognized on the other side that a visible Church existed from the first, and that, if the Gospels give us at all a faithful picture of our Lord's teaching, He had plainly foreseen not only His own rejection by the Jewish people, but the rejection of His followers, and He had trained His Apostles to be the leaders and rulers of the true Israelites of the Covenant. If Christians were the New Israel, an ἐκκλησία is postulated already.

It is much if this is recognized. It narrows immensely the field of difference, even if we are careful not to press it for more than it is worth. At least the purely individualistic or congregational conception of Christianity is excluded. To talk of "the Church" is no longer to speak an alien language.

But, of course, as on that side, so on this, we are not yet agreed because we are becoming more intelligible to one another. To us the Church implies the Sacraments, the fellowship of the disciples in a supernatural life fed by those outward and visible channels of grace which we name Sacraments, the natural, original, indispensable expressions of the ἐνέργεια of the Spirit in the Body. If the material as well as the spiritual is God's creation, if the Son of God took human flesh wherein to redeem mankind, so also until the consummation of all things His continuous work among His redeemed people on earth has its external aspect in this visible fellowship of sacramental rites.

It may be that even we ourselves do not realize how entirely in their original meaning the Sacraments were Sacraments of the common life of the Body. That the two great Sacraments were, the one the initiation into the Christian fellowship, the other the normal sustenance of the life of the Christian fellowship and the primary purpose of its assemblies, we recognize—of Baptism it would be universally admitted, and though later developments have tended to lay stress on other aspects of the Eucharist, yet at least the rule that no priest may say Mass alone keeps the original principle alive. That Confirmation was, to the early Church, not merely an adjunct, but a necessary element in the sacrament of initiation, we are coming to recognize. Holy Orders, originally and ideally always conferred by the Bishop in the presence and with the assent of the Christian

people, was the solemn and public setting apart of those who were called to minister for the Body of Christ. Absolution was the open restoration of an openly separated member to his place in the fellowship of the Body. And in each of these sacraments the symbol or "matter" of the grace imparted was, save where the Gospel had given a special rite, the Laying on of Hands.*

This fellowship in one outward and visible society of the disciples, with its life sacramentally imparted and maintained, is the clue to all Church history and the justification of our own appeal. It is plain matter of fact that a society of Christians, calling itself the Church and claiming to represent Christ, did actually exist and did assert so far back as adequate evidence is available—that is, as far back as about the middle of the second century—that its Creed, its Sacraments, its Scriptures, were derived by it directly from the Apostles of Jesus Christ. And though this society had a chequered history, and controversies arose within it, and sections of Christians left the Great Church, or were excluded by it as not corresponding to its principles, it was, for several centuries onwards, never really doubtful which was the community that had a right to call itself Catholic, and to regard itself as the only representative of the continuous and organic life of the Church of earlier days. At special moments and for brief periods an issue newly raised might seem to be clouded in the mists of uncertainty, as when Arianism tried to make good its claim to be the true interpretation of the Christian tradition: but to the historian taking large views the Catholic Church is always there, and its testimony against particularist discipline or unbalanced and exaggerated teaching always ultimately final.

Thus there was on the whole, in the first five or six centuries after Christ, a real valid Catholic witness and consent decisive sooner or later of each controversy as it emerged. There were

* Emphasis on this conception of the sacraments in their relation to the common life of the Body would, I believe, make the whole sacramental idea more easy of understanding to any who have once grasped the idea of the Church. I cannot but think that it is a mistake if, in the appeal to history as against ordinary Protestantism, commencement is made from the topic of the ministry. We must begin first with the truth of the Visible Church. So far as that has now become common ground, let us be thankful and, taking courage for the next task, try to show how the sacramental idea is a natural corollary of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Visible Church. Only in the third place can the subject of the ministry be profitably approached.

True, the doctrine of Apostolic Succession was the pivot doctrine of the early Tracts. But those Tracts were addressed to the clergy who were committed *ex hypothesi* to belief in the Church and (at least in some sense) the sacraments. Our appeal to-day to history is made as much to those without as to those within. For the latter we have established our case. The Church of England, if it is not to be defended on our principles, will have to be defended on grounds indistinguishable in principle from those of the separated bodies. I do not believe that any *tertium quid* can permanently maintain itself.

at the same time a succession of exponents of the Christian faith both in East and West, from Irenæus and Tertullian and Origen, through the great fathers of the fourth century, to Augustine and Theodoret and Leo, and more sporadically after them, whose individual creative work is the counterpart and complement of this common tradition, the implications of which it elicited and welded into coherence.

But other forces were at work which were to develop with fatal result. The great impulse to unity, strongest and most vigorous when Christians were a persecuted minority, gradually lost its power. Centrifugal tendencies, especially from the fourth century, became more and more acute. Different parts of the Church developed their national or racial or linguistic equipment not merely side by side with, but in antagonism to, one another. Long before East and West finally separated, local distinctions had become so marked that one can no longer speak of a combined witness of the Church in the same full sense as for earlier days. Since the close of the continuous series of the great teachers of the Church synchronizes roughly with the increased accentuation of these divisions, the concentration of the Anglican appeal on the first five or six centuries of the history of the Church has a real justification and a rational basis.

It is then, I think, a fair statement of the Tractarian appeal to history that, though it is not limited to any age, it is specially an appeal to those generations which drew their inspiration most directly from the Apostles, which produced the greatest succession of interpreters of the Christian faith, which give us the witness of a universal and truly Catholic communion. And in substance that is also our appeal to-day.

IV. We stand, in the first place, on the idea of a Church, a visible Church, a Catholic Church: and there is only one Catholic Church conceivable, the Church which has been from the beginning. Nature and history alike teach us that individualism pure and simple cannot guarantee the security of the Gospel message. God created man, as we see in the family and in the State, for fellowship, and He works according to the laws of the nature He has made. You cannot rely on having a succession, continued through the ages, of individuals capable of understanding and of transmitting the tradition entrusted to them. Only in a society can there be security for permanence.

And what we should expect *a priori* is surely borne out by the observed facts of history. The doctrine of Atonement through the Passion of Christ was the stand-by of German Protestantism in its early days. Yet in Protestant Germany

the body of inherited teaching has crumbled away so steadily and so surely that the doctrine once proclaimed as central is in danger of disappearing. It is in Catholic Germany that the crucifixes by the roadside still bring to the daily remembrance of all who pass Christ's message to a suffering world of suffering as the way to victory. Disintegration of the Gospel tradition is written large over the history of continental Protestantism—and is it of Protestantism on the continent only? Where, save in the Society, its corporate life, its framework of faith and order, its contact with the past and its guarantee for the future, can we find the security we need?

But to state this side of the truth is not to overlook the other side. Society has its dangers, as well as individualism: the Christian ideal implies the action and interaction of both forces. Only so will full weight and impetus be given to the message.

The life of primitive Christians did embody, unconsciously no doubt, the attempt to give expression to both aspects. We realize what membership of the One Body meant to them. Do not let us forget how much largeness and tolerance and free play to individual thought co-existed with this stress on unity. The intellectual atmosphere of the early Church was, within the limits of the Creed, extraordinarily free. You cannot read Justin or Irenæus or Origen without being impressed, carried sometimes off your feet, with the large sweep of their thought. Their controversy with outsiders—pagans, Jews, Gnostics—was so tremendous that the "great Church" was tolerant as well as orthodox. And the schisms in the early Church were puritan schisms: Montanists, Novatianists, Donatists, found the Church too liberal for them, and set up for themselves outside it. Tertullian excommunicated the Catholics, not the Catholics Tertullian. As elements in the larger life of the Church, rigorism and Puritanism have real value: but it is too often the case that rigorists and Puritans "made the face of those sad whom the Lord had not made sad."

Is there not a special call for us of the Church of England to-day to try and hold the balance true by setting in the one scale an unswerving adhesion to the essentials of faith and order—the framework which holds the edifice together, and with which we may not tamper without risk to the stability of the House of God—and in the other a resolute determination to claim and allow liberty in that wide sphere of practice, of rule of life, of thought, where both the regional Church and the individual have their respective right to freedom? On the one side "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God":

on the other side, "He that eateth, to the Lord he eateth, and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not"; "There are diversities of gifts, but all from one Spirit." It is the same Apostle who proclaims both principles. Do not suppose that the validity of either was exhausted with the controversies of the primitive age.

C. H. TURNER.

THE TRADITION OF THE CATECHISM

PROFESSOR JUNG of Vienna, the eminent psychologist, has told us that while the Catholic Church is a creation of myth and credulity, it must be maintained in existence for many years yet because of its long experience and secure touch in matters affecting human nature.

This reference from the materialistic school of psycho-analysis is praise indeed. Let us see what we have done to earn it, especially in relation to the training of children.

I

The traditions of Christianity are common to the whole of Europe, and some parts of Asia and Africa; and they have spread to such parts of the new world as have come under the influence of Christendom.

These traditions, or rather this tradition, was not at first committed to writing, and later, when the Church became stronger, only with great caution. In the Middle Ages it became universal to write down such parts of the tradition as could be expressed in words, and finally, with the invention of printing, books came out which could be in everybody's hands.

In England a collection of these traditions was published officially under the title of *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*—that is the whole Catholic and Universal Church of Christendom—*According to the Use of the Church of England*, and with this was bound the *Psalter or Psalms of David*, the essential handbook of Christian devotion.

The English Church is lucky in possessing this handbook, which has come down to us practically unchanged from mediæval times.

This book is a storehouse of tradition. But it is a living tradition, not a dead one of laws and notes and rubrics. It is a tradition which was then living and strong, a tradition in which English Christianity lived and moved and had its being.

That is why it cannot now be studied without reference to other documents from the past, which throw light upon the life of the Church in those times.

It must be added that it was a purified tradition. It aimed at presenting the simple mediæval religion without the later mediæval accretions, the religion which seems to be found at its best in the twelfth century rather than the sixteenth. This tradition is simply the life with God through Christ in the companionship of the Holy Ghost; it is expressed as far as language can do it in the Creed; it is realized mystically and practically in the Mass.

It can be traced back through the Dark Ages, and its content is always found to be the same. It came to us from the Roman Church of the sixth century, and we have plenty of light on the tradition of that period. It can be traced yet further back into the period of the persecutions and of the Early Church, and the Gospels, the Acts, and Epistles of apostolic men come to us from the earliest stages of this same tradition.

This is the vision of our Prayer Book, the plain simplicity of the evangelical and catholic tradition, a vision which we must frankly admit we have never realized, but which it is also fair to say has never been lost. Our special study is the series of initiation experiences which the Church proposes to the neophyte by way of admission to the supreme act of worship and Communion in the Holy Eucharist.

II

If we take an acknowledged authority like Mgr. Duchesne in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, we find that the steps by which a man entered into the Communion of the Christian brotherhood were these:

First a period of preparation and teaching, combined with ceremonies of exorcism; secondly, the rite of Baptism; thirdly, the rite of Confirmation; and fourthly, First Communion. By these steps a man was brought to Christ out of the sin and error of the dark heathen world.

But as the centuries pass, and the young nations grow strong in the faith, as the Moor is rolled out of France and Spain, the Asiatic out of Eastern Europe, and the cruel heathenism of the North out of England, a change passes over Christendom.

The community is now roughly or nominally Christian, and it is the child, not the man, who is brought to Christ.

As a result we find curious inversions and alterations in the ceremonies. The exorcism is combined with the Baptism, which it still precedes, while the preparation is deferred, and in the West leads up to Confirmation. Finally, when heathenism

is a thing of the far past, except for a few curious witchcraft ceremonies and popular superstitions, the exorcism is abandoned, and in the English book the sign of the cross is now used after the Baptism instead of before. Exorcism itself falls into disuse, though with the consent of the Bishop it may still be used in cases of possession.

Times have altered again, and in these days new conditions call for a fresh treatment of the old tradition. Among these new conditions we may enumerate the following:

(*a*) The late age of Confirmation, though there is a strong reaction from this.

(*b*) The multiplication of printed books, and the universal knowledge of reading.

(*c*) The loss of the Holy Eucharist as the main service of God's family.

(*d*) The disuse of the Sacrament of Penance.

(*e*) The disproportionate enthusiasm for Bible reading which has ousted other Christian activities, and threatened to displace the Holy Communion as the central Christian experience.

Much as this has done for the English race, it has made our Christianity lop-sided. The importation of two long Lessons into Matins and Evensong, the institution of the Sunday School, and the training of our young men through Bible Classes, have profoundly altered the original Christian tradition.

III

I now proceed to sketch the tradition as it appears in the Prayer Book; not the forms and ceremonies preserved in it, but the living tradition which they enshrine. This picture is ideal, not actual. It represents the late mediæval practice, as purified in the minds of the reformers.

The sequence of ceremonies leading from Baptism to Confirmation, and from Confirmation to Holy Communion, is the Parish Priest's *Manual of Child Training*. If he has the wisdom to see what lies behind the ceremonies, they give him a complete system for teaching his children "the things which a Christian ought to know and believe for his soul's health." In the same way the *Visitation of the Sick* is a manual, to guide the Parish Priest in his ministrations; I once heard of it being read right through at a man's bedside, and the man died. Something of the same effect has been obtained by a mechanical use of the Catechism.

Actually the Catechism enshrines a living tradition, which was the same in the days of Alfric or St. Augustine, and is

developed from that catechism with which the most excellent Theophilus was catechized by St. Luke.

1. *Birth Ceremonies.*—On the birth of a child, it is brought as soon as possible into the congregation, where a number of the brethren, known as godparents, vouch for it, and the Preparation is anticipated by a series of questions based on the traditional teaching.

The Baptism then takes place, after which the child is formally received into the congregation. This part of the ceremony closes with a weighty charge to the godparents.

The mother goes to church as soon as possible to give thanks, and receives Communion.

After this the child goes with his mother Sunday by Sunday to the Service of Communion.

2. *The Godparents.*—Now let us follow the work of the godparents, who are responsible for the postponed preparation.

They are to see that the child comes regularly to the Communion Service, where he can hear sermons.

They are to see that he can say the Creed, the Paternoster, and the Commandments in the English tongue, and answer such questions as are contained in the Catechism.

And from time to time the child is visited by his Parish Priest, who hears his confession, and gives him his blessing.

3. *Confirmation.*—One day the Bishop arrives and sits in his throne in the Church. The godparents bring the children to the Bishop, and present them to him for Confirmation. He catechizes them, and if he is satisfied with their answers, lays hands on them, and thus admits them to Communion.

It may come as a shock to us to realize that the children may be as young as five. We have pictures of the godparents holding them up to be confirmed by the Bishop.

Subsequent teaching was no doubt obtained from the Sunday catechizing after the Second Lesson at Evensong, but more especially through the Gospels, Epistles, and Sermons of the Communion Service.

IV

Now, I would like to point out that these are our terms of reference in the task of educating the children of the Church. This is the essence and content of Christian training. The Church knows no other training for life than preparation for Confirmation and preparation for Communion. Above all, there must be no other end proposed, such as an examination, or going up into a Bible Class. The progress in Christianity is marked by so many steps in the Church itself among the body of the baptized people.

Of this training the Catechism is a part, an essential part, but a part only. It is the instructional part of the ritual, what freemasons would call the preparation for initiation, and, like the ritual of that body, is put into the form of dialogue.

The main part of the training is the life, the prayers at home, the confession of sin, the social life of the parish, and, above all, the parish worship in which even a child has his importance.

Think how the Holy Communion service fits in with the general scheme: the Our Father, Ten Commandments, and Creed (though not the Apostles' Creed); the Sermon which is always a simple talk on the Gospel, or a plain homily on Christian practice; the great Intercession into which all the needs of the parish are interwoven; the angelic worship; and the Divine Presence.

It is not to be wondered at that no children's services were deemed necessary in those days.

V

No part of the Prayer Book is so misused as the Catechism, and none offers such wonderful opportunities.

We all know what "learning the Catechism" means. It means taking the Catechism home in a dreadfully printed penny edition, learning a section of it by heart, and repeating it to "teacher" in a monotonous sing-song voice without any expression or meaning: ". . . renounce the devil and all his works, and walk in the same all the days of my life." You see, the effort is entirely devoted to getting the words. A further effort has to be made to get their meaning, which is generally given in smaller type below; but by this time the patient is mentally exhausted, and the work is not done. Few children ever knew the whole Catechism. I never did; the "Desire" gravelled me.

Now, this is clearly wrong. I have no pedantic objection to teaching children the words first and their meaning after. It is sometimes an excellent thing to do. But this idea of learning the whole Catechism is a nightmare. And if the idea were correct, we would be forced to the conclusion that the children of Elizabethan England learned the whole of it by the age of five. Which is absurd. So one comes to a closer study of the text, and one discovers the true facts.

A child must be able to *say* the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. These are the three formulæ he has to learn by heart; and to put it in a dull manner, they give him a basis on which he can build his conceptions of worship, his dogmatic and his moral theology. Now note a difference.

He is to be able "to answer to such questions as in the Short Catechism are contained." There is no direction for him to learn them by heart and say them. He has to be able to answer questions. And please note, not *the* questions but

such questions as in the Short Catechism are contained. We are not tied to those exact questions, any more than we are tied to those exact answers. We are tied to the method, and to the tradition handed down to us in the Catechism.

I will go further. The Prayer Book forbids us to use the exact words, forbids us explicitly and definitely to do so. All instruction is to be conveyed in the vulgar tongue, an expression which is chosen to imply "the tongue commonly used by ordinary people." Now the answers to the Catechism are not expressed in the language commonly employed by ordinary people; and therefore I would be disloyal to the Prayer Book if I were to employ them. It would be "a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the Custom of the Primitive Church" to give instruction in a tongue "not understanded of the people."

What I have to do as a Parish Priest, under definite penalties, clearly laid down in the Canons, is to get the children together and catechize them in plain English, such as they can understand. Of course, it is much easier to give them a penny catechism, and let them "say" it. But that is a lazy custom, consequent upon the decline of church life and the introduction of printing. The duty of a Parish Priest is to catechize, and superintendents should insist on their Vicar doing it if he visits their school.

The Catechism is a basis for catechizing, not a piece of repetition. And unfortunately catechizing is a lost art.

VI

We now come to the St. Sulpice method.

In France the tradition of catechizing never died or dwindled so completely as it did with us. And in the nineteenth century the learned and saintly Bishop Dupanloup took the old tradition and restored it. But I am afraid that he restored it in the sense in which Sir Gilbert Scott "restored" the old churches of England. The Bishop has the fervour of a Methodist, and the charm of his book, *The Ministry of Catechizing*, is its saintly and humorous spirit.

The *system* is detestable.

This system has been introduced from France and has usurped the title of the "Catechism System." But it is as foreign and artificial as paper flowers, lace vestments, six candles behind the altar, or any other importation from the same quarters. And as a matter of fact no English priest has found it practicable to use the whole St. Sulpice method.

To give a test, the St. Sulpice Catechisms never use the Catechism. It isn't suitable.

An Australian Bishop has said that our Catechism wants remoulding so that each answer contains the words of the question, thus enabling it to "stand on its own." This is a good example of the St. Sulpice method. Its questions and answers go like this:

Q. Who is the Head of the body the Church ?
A. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of the body the Church.
Q. What are the Nine Orders of Angels ?
A. The Nine Orders of Angels are Angels, Archangels, Cherubim, Seraphim, Thrones, Powers, Dominions, Principalities, and Intelligences, . . . or whatever they are.

Each answer is complete, so that if the child forgets the question, he will still understand the answer he has learned. Now this is admirable for a purely philosophic or dogmatic Catechism, like that of Westminster, for instance. It spoils our Catechism. For instance, in—

Q. What is your name ?
A. My name is John.

it is hard to see any improvement.

And this brings one to the final point in connection with the Catechism, which illuminates the whole of it. It is not a lump of philosophy or dogma, cast for the sake of convenience into the form of question and answer. It is a dialogue between a Catechist and his children, which is itself a part of the initiation ceremony—that part, namely, which leads from the first to the second degree. And the things the Catechist has to say are as thrilling and as important as the things the child has to say; and like other rituals it has to be carried out in due dramatic form without the use of a book. Only it is to be inspired and illuminated with all kinds of side-questions, discussions, stories, arguments, dissertations, prayers, ejaculations, and other fresh and humorous by-play which the good Bishop Dupanloup understood so well.

VII

On examination the Catechism itself is found to bear this interpretation and no other. It begins with the request for the child's name, which is not needed for dogmatic, but for practical purposes. It is needed for the roll: it supplies a point of contact: it at once creates personal interest: it allows for a dissertation on Christian names, surnames, and Saints: it gives an opportunity to bring out the register and trace the Baptism: it provokes a most delightful discussion on the names of all the children, which the Parish Priest interprets, and altogether gets the family feeling to start with. And no doubt it is the

dwindled remnant of the eighth-century ceremony of the Inscriptio Nominum, or inscribing of the names, which began the whole set of initiatory rites at Rome.

And, indeed, there is something most impressive in seeing your name being inscribed in what Edward Lear calls "a most tremendous book." The children feel that they are indeed members of the Church.

Then the catechizing goes on:

Who gave you your name ?
When ?
What did you then become ?
What did they do for you ?
What were the three things ?
And don't you think you are bound to believe and do as they promised for you ?

If all has gone well you will not have to supply the answer to this question—

Yes indeed, and by God's help so I will.

And you may yourself take the rest of that answer as it appears in the Prayer Book, and bid the child thank God for these privileges, and pray for grace to continue in them.

The thing is no barren piece of dogma or teaching. It is a living, not to say lively, piece of the actual ritual, leading up to an important step of assuming responsibility, "Yes verily, and by God's help so I will."

You must retain the wonderful old Greek and Latin words so charged with meaning and romance, "renunciation," "pomp," and the rest of them, and illustrate them by descriptions of the old baptism ritual, and stories of Saints, and shrewd remarks that bring home the dangers and temptations of the world to-day. Those old words will enrich the child's mind, and open a treasure-house of imagination to him.

VIII

Then follows the Creed, a further stage in the initiation. It is the Traditio Symboli, the giving of the password, which was the crucial point previous to the actual baptism itself. The Creed is very simply and beautifully explained, but again you will not insist on the actual words, though you will see that "redemption" and "sanctification" are added to the vocabulary.

You will tell how this Belief came to the heathen English, and contrast their belief in devils with the Christian belief in the Father. The stories of St. Aidan, St. Cuthbert, and of St. Patrick, form an introduction to his study, which is essentially the story of Our Lord Himself.

IX

The Ten Commandments form a most debatable part of the Catechism. I know that many writers to-day are against their use, and that Bishop Gore is one of them. At the same time, I believe we shall be very wise to retain them in the shortened form suggested in the proposed Alternative Prayer Book.

They are very direct and impressive, and they give a splendid opportunity for contrasting the old law of the Jews and the new laws of the Christians. The story of the Exodus and Sinai should be given, and the children should be told that this is what the Jews believed. The Second Commandment gives an opportunity of telling the Creation story, while at the same time it is pointed out that we don't believe that the sea goes in underneath the land. Nor do we keep the Sabbath.

What, then, is the Christian Law ?

In the old Ordo Romanus, the most impressive of the preparation ceremonies was the *Traditio Legis Christianæ*, or giving of the Christian Law. The four gospels were carried in and laid one at each corner of the altar. Instruction was given on each, and the first verses of each were read. The modern substitute for this would be the use of the Gospels, each child being taught how to find them, and read for himself what Our Lord said about the Law.

It would probably be best to read the passage Mark xii. 28 ff., and learn the two great laws. It cannot have escaped notice that the Catechism goes on to do this, and while it would be a barbarity to expect children to say the whole of the " Duties," there is no reason why they should not learn this much—

1. My duty towards God is to believe in Him, to fear Him, and to love Him with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength.

2. My duty towards my neighbour is to love him as myself, and to do to all men, as I would they should do unto me.

Here we have the *Traditio Legis Christianæ ;* and the child is advancing as before in the steps of the ancient ritual. Mgr. Duchesne thinks that this ceremony finds artistic expression in a picture very common in early Christian decoration. Jesus sits on a mountain from which flow the four rivers of Paradise. Around Him stand the Apostles. St. Peter, their chief, receives from Him a book, emblematic of the Christian Law, on which is inscribed DOMINUS LEGEM DAT. This picture suggests exactly the right atmosphere for this piece of catechizing, and links it with the Beatitudes and the Feeding of the Five Thousand, which also took place on that mysterious mountain in Galilee,

more important than Sinai, where the risen Lord met His disciples, and whence all this tradition comes.

The remainder of the " Duties " is based on the Commandments, and is best taken by free catechizing.

What does the first commandment teach Christians ? etc. It is quite easy to assign the clauses of the Duties to their respective commandments; but the children should be encouraged to explain them in their own words, and discuss knotty questions of morality. Incidentally the Duties make a perfectly good basis for self-examination.

X

The tradition of the law is followed by the tradition of the Our Father, and here with sound liturgical knowledge the original Catechism stopped.

The habit of using the Catechism as " repetition " has quite robbed us of the dramatic effect of the introduction to the Our Father. The Christian Law has been discussed, and that piece of work is over, and there is a pause. Then the Catechist says solemnly, " My good child, know this . . ."

The effect, when it is taken as ritual, is remarkable; and besides that, it gives the Catechist a " piece " to say, which seems very fair and reasonable to the child. He rises, and says the Lord's Prayer, the climax of every liturgical office.

The " Desire " is not a happy paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer. Some of its simplicity is admirable, but there is an over-emphasis on the work of the evil one, on the assumption, I suppose, that the last clause should be translated, " Deliver us from the evil one," as it almost certainly should be. The words " and that He will keep us from all sin and wickedness, and from our ghostly enemy, and from everlasting death " ought to be omitted, and I trust they will.

The remainder makes a prayer that might actually be used at children's gatherings; but it is questionable whether it really adds to the simplicity of the Lord's Prayer itself.

XI

The final section on the sacraments is a later addition, in a different style, and a very admirable addition too, though it is of the dogmatic or philosophic type, and does not fit in with the first part. The only improvement, except for mere verbal alterations, would be in the question " What is the inward or spiritual grace (in baptism) ?" where the answer should simply be " A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." The expression " children of wrath " is most unfortunate.

Apart from this subsequent addition, we have seen that the

Catechism is a simple ritual in which the child is led step by step along the paths of the Christian tradition from the Inscriptio Nominum to the point at which he calls God his Father.

Taken in the way I have suggested, it is obvious that it can easily be taught, and that the whole Catechism can be run through very quickly, the essential formulæ being repeated by heart, and the intermediate steps being done by free catechizing. It will also be appreciated that if the child is catechized in this fashion he has not only learned about the baptismal promise, he has shouldered it; he has not only learned the Christian Law, he has adopted it; he has not only learned the Lord's Prayer, he has prayed.

And throughout the catechizing there can be a wealth of illustration not only from everyday and homely things, which is very important, but also from the Holy Scriptures, which were written for this very purpose. It will also be obvious that education along these lines is preparation for Confirmation and Communion, and full participation in the Christian life.

XII

These facts are not only of interest to clergy, on whom alone is laid the necessity of catechizing. They are of interest to Sunday School teachers on whom, in these busy days, the burden of the education of the children is very largely laid. What is in the first place the priest's responsibility is partially transferred to his assistants, though this does not excuse him if he salves his conscience by twelve hurried Confirmation classes.

The teacher knows that there are new methods to-day, and a new world to live in, and the little creatures they have to teach are creatures of this new world. But nothing absolves any of us from our obligation to teach the tradition enshrined in the catechism. That is our trust from Christ. And allow me to tell you, it is our strength. In a world of crazes, of new fads in education, and new theories in psychology, we pass on to our children the solid tradition we have inherited from the past. We initiate them into the lore of Christ, and lead them along the steps which all the saints have taken, until we bring them to the perfect knowledge of Christ in love and prayer and sacrament.

Professor Jung congratulates us on our inherited deftness in psychology. Apparently we stand foursquare to the world, and shall continue to do so for many a generation. Our methods have proved good for 2,000 years, and appear exactly to fit human nature. He was not referring to our educational tradition, which is that of the Catechism, but to our Sacrament of Absolution. But the same is true of our educational tradition, as it is true also of our tradition of Ministration to the Sick, and

of every other solid tradition which we inherit from the primitive Church. Whoever made our traditions knew human nature, for they appear to fit human nature; and we claim that they were made by Him who made human nature.

And to those traditions the Church is everywhere returning. We are going back to the rock from whence we were hewn, and the pit from which we were digged. We are remembering Abraham our father, and Sarah that bare us. And though we may be losing numbers, I have no shadow of doubt that we are gaining power.

Our Lord used the catechetical or, at any rate, the oral method Himself. We read that He went into a mountain, and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him, and He taught them. He certainly taught them orally, and they remembered his essential sayings by heart. The disciples went out into the world to teach. They used the catechetical method, when they initiated others. Of this there is no doubt. Nothing was written at first.* When the Apostles died, the tradition of the Catechism was carried on. The picture of Christ giving the Law represents the Roman tradition on the subject. The Parish Priest catechizing his children is standing in the place of Christ on the holy mountain. He is following the command to "go out . . . make disciples . . . teach . . . baptize," and the Lord is with him, though it be unto the end of the world.

And of the children it may be said, "Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn."

PHILIP CARRINGTON.

THE SACRED FISH

A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION

OF all early Christian symbols found in the Roman Catacombs, or mentioned by ecclesiastical writers, that of the Sacred Fish —the Divine ICHTHYS—is at once the most ancient and the most important. Dating, almost certainly, from apostolic

* And therefore it is quite correct to say that the Gospels were written to supplement and illustrate the Catechism. St. Luke i. 4 speaks of giving Theophilus the solid certainty of the things in which he has been orally instructed. St. Mark certainly takes the knowledge of the oral teaching for granted; and who can doubt that this teaching included the main traditions that live in our Catechism, repentance and faith, baptism and the laying on of hands, the law of love, and the Our Father? (*cf.* Heb. iv. 1).

times, it was employed as an arcana sign during the first three centuries, to express, first, the doctrine of our Lord's divinity as Saviour of the world; and, second, the incorporation of souls who, saved by Him, owed their new spiritual birth to the element of water, and were, in the Eucharist—to employ the phrase of St. Prosper of Aquitaine—"illuminated and fed by the Holy Flesh of the Fish."

St. Clement of Alexandria, in the great Orphic Hymn attributed to him, speaks of Christ as "the Fisher of mortal men, who, by His sweet life, entices away from the wild ocean of the world's sea of sin the holy fish that are to be saved."

Christ is the ΙΧΘΥΣ ΖΩΝΤΩΝ—the "Fish of the Living," as one inscription has it; according to Tertullian, "the Great Fish—the true ΙΧΘΥΣ; and we, little fishes, sharing His nature." So, the Font, says St. Optatus, through Christ descending into it, becomes a "saving fish-fountain (piscina)." And, again, of the Eucharist, it is said, in the second-century epitaph of Abercius, that "Faith led the pilgrim on his way, and set before him for food the Fish from the fountain, Mighty and Stainless, which a pure Virgin grasped." Thus did the early Church interpret the symbol of the "Fish," as, at once, the life (in Baptism) and the sustenance (in the Eucharist) of the Christian soul; and Augustine, having in mind one of the pictures of the Catacombs, writes: "Our Lord prepared for the seven disciples a meal of the Fish, which lay before them on the glowing coals, and of Bread. The roasted Fish is Christ who suffered—*Piscis assus Christus passus.*"*

So far, then, the symbol is to be regarded as having been at once a Creed and a Sign—unintelligible to pagans, but full of precious meaning to Christians. The important question, therefore, arises: Why did the primitive Church lay hold on this particular symbol? Was it original; or was it derived from some source more ancient than Christianity itself? In other words, Did Christian faith invent the symbol? or did it put its own interpretation on a sign which it found ready to its hand?

To these questions the answer most commonly given, and accepted, is that the symbol arose in connection with the famous acrostic quoted by Eusebius† and St. Augustine‡ from the so-called sibylline verses, which give us, by taking the initial letters of so many successive lines, the Greek words:

ΙΗCΟΥC ΧΡΕΙCΤΟC ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟC ΣΩΤΗΡ
Jesus Christ Son of God Saviour;

and then, the initial letters of these several words taken together, ΙΧΘΥΣ.

* Tract. cxxiii. in Joan.
† Oratio Constant. ad Cœt. Sanct., § 18.
‡ *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. 23.

According to Martene, in olden times it was the custom, in the Church of France, to sing these sibylline verses at Christmas with great solemnity.*

But this explanation, illuminating as it undoubtedly is, does not fully account for the symbol; for behind it is a further question, What inspired the sibyl? and it is to the solution of this problem that the present writer now addresses himself.

Let it be borne in mind that in the Catacombs are to be found many emblems of indisputably pagan origin, to which Christian meanings had been attached. Amongst these is Orpheus with his lyre, used to express the idea of Christ drawing all men unto Him, and bringing untamed souls to His feet, as the fabled Thracian is said to have "charmed the wild beasts by the might of his song."† Very prominent are symbols borrowed from the East. We have, for instance, the swastika —many times on tombs and, notably, on the robe of our Lord and on the tunic of "Diogenes the Fossor" in the Cemetery of Domitilla. Nor need we seek very far for a reason for the adoption of such signs by the Church, if we remember that in the early days of the Christian era the old religion of Rome was beginning to break up, and that Oriental cults were rapidly making their way amongst the more intellectual sections of the Western world. It is worth noting that on the fragment of the altar of Mithra, to be seen in the narthex of the basilica of San Clemente in Rome, both the Sun and the Fish form part of the decoration. Since, therefore, it would have been extremely dangerous for the faithful to make use of purely Christian emblems, such as the Cross itself, it was natural that they should have adopted such pagan signs as might convey the meanings they wished to express. Was the Fish symbol one of these? There is a very considerable body of evidence to show that, not only was it derived from the ancient East, but that its significance in many of the Asiatic religions was not unlike that which it acquired amongst the first Christians.

In all the ancient world, the fish had been an object of worship; and though it was forbidden to make "the likeness of any fish that is in the water" (Deut. iv. 10), yet, since fish were the only living creatures not smitten by the curse of the Deluge, the sign *Pisces* was regarded by the Hebrews as their peculiar constellation, and was often engraved on signet rings. Of importance, too, is the fish which, in the life of Tobias, plays so prominent a part, and which many of the Fathers of the Church regarded as a type of Christ, possessing power of freeing from the devil and from blindness, as well as providing nourish-

* *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, lib. iv., c. xii. 13 (*cf. Roma Sotterranea*, Northcote and Brownlow, vol. ii., p. 61).

† *Cf.* Clement Alex., *Ante-Nicene*, lib. i., pp. 19-20.

ment for the journey. The relation of the two fundamental mysteries of Christianity comes into view at once—the "illumination" of Baptism and the "food" of the Eucharist. That Raphael, in his splendid picture of the Madonna at the Escurial, in which Tobias is handing a fish to the Holy Child, had this ancient Christian symbol in view can hardly be doubted.

Throughout the East, sacred streams, with their teeming fish-life—דָּג from דָּגָה to multiply abundantly—were a symbol of divinity; and from the sea or stream, as the fountain or source, to the personification of the god or goddess, the transition was easy. Thus we have Dagon (דָּגוֹן), the principal god of the Philistines, a fish-god, though with the face and hands of a man, and generally identified with the Babylonian fish-god, Ea, the patron-divinity of Eridu, the god of the ocean, of water, and of wisdom.*

That there should be a doubt whether Dagon was a fish- or a corn-god is of no consequence in our present inquiry. Philo Byblius, deriving the name from dāgān=*corn*, interprets *σίτων*, and makes Dagon a god of husbandry—*Ζευς ἀρότριος*. The Hebrew text of 1 Samuel v. 4, by some corruption, reads, "only Dagon was left on him"; which David Kimchi (*ob. c.* A.D. 1235) ingeniously interprets, "only the form of a fish was left," adding, "It is said that Dagon, from his navel down, had the form of a fish; and from his navel up, the form of a man, for it is said, 'his two hands were cut off.'" A bas-relief in the Louvre shows Dagon as half-man in the upper part, and half-fish in the lower part. So an Assyrian representation of Dagon, in Layard's *Nineveh*, shows him as a man with a fish-skin cloak—the fish-head forming a kind of hood.

It is not impossible that, by the help of etymology, there may have been applied to Dagon the description given by Lucian and others of the goddess Dercĕto (probably the same as Atargatis), who was worshipped on the same coast. Not a few scholars have, indeed, identified her with Dagon. There was a Babylonian god Dāgān, whose name appears in conjunction with Anu, and often with Ninib; he was, therefore, probably a god of heaven.†

In 2 Maccabees xii. 26 mention is made of the Temple at Carnion of Atargatis, the Syrian goddess above mentioned, who had her principal Palestinian seat of worship at Ashkelon, where she was probably identified with Aphrodite. Here, as at Hierapolis, or Bambyce on the Euphrates, sacred fish were kept at her shrine. At Ashkelon the goddess herself was

* *Cf.* Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i., p. 544A.

† Geo. A. Smith, art. "Dagon," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

represented as a woman with a fish's tail. Atargatis and her son plunged into the waters and were changed into fishes—an example of that class of legend in which the divine life of the waters resides in the sacred fish that inhabit them.* How easy is the transference of ideas from such a conception to that of the waters of Baptism, by which, says St. Paulinus of Nola, "the Fisher of men draws them forth freely for God, by means of the hook of the life-giving Word, rather to give new life than to destroy."† Or, again, when the same writer claims to have been made a fish, "the son of a dolphin," through having received Baptism at the hands of "a dolphin"—the bishop named Delphinus;‡ just as, long before, Tertullian had said of all Christians, that we are "little fishes, born in water, after the example of Jesus Christ our Fish."§ These and other like ideas find expression in Christian art, as, for instance, in the Catacombs we see a painting in which the figure of a man catching a fish is immediately succeeded by a man baptizing a child; or, where, in the mosaic pavement of the Baptistery at Pesaro, of the age of Justinian, we have the figure, partly of a man, partly of a fish, with the legend:

EST HOMO NON TOTVS, MEDIVS SED PISCIS AB IMO,

telling us that he is not yet wholly a man, but a fish in all the lower parts of his body; clearly implying that as he emerges from the laver of the New Birth, he will altogether cease to be a fish and become a living man.‖

In the Catacombs the Twin Fish are a frequent emblem of Christ and the soul, newborn in the waters of Baptism, or fed with the bread of the Eucharist. The two fishes are sometimes bound together by a cord; or, as on a gravestone found at Modena, and belonging to the third century, united by a row of eucharistic wafers passing from the mouth of one to that of the other. Twin fish are also seen on a column of St. Germain de Près, the oldest church in Paris, dating from about the fifth century; and again, on the west front of the cathedral of Autun.

Have these twin fish an astronomical significance? Was the Star of the Magi identical with that extraordinary conjunction of planets occurring in the constellation of Pisces in A.U.C. 748, and which led Kepler to place the birth of Christ in that year? The statement of the mediæval Rabbi Abarbanel, that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces is to be a

* *Cf.* Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i., p. 194; Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 173 *ff.*

† *Ep. ad Florent.*, xxxii., p. 282. Ed. Antwerp, 1622.

‡ Ep. xvi., p. 178. § *De Baptismo*, c. i.

‖ *Cf. Roma Sotterranea*, part ii., pp. 58-60.

sign of the coming of the Messiah, may have been derived ultimately from ancient traditions known to the Chaldæans; but such a conjunction occurred in May, October, and December, 7 B.C., a date very closely corresponding with that of the oracle sent by Kadphisas I. of Great Yüe-Tchi to the Emperor of China; the fact of the new star being in Pisces possibly explaining the Oriental *mandara* of the White-robed *Kwan-Yin* coming in the cloud with a Great Fish.*

Have we, again, some further light on one of the bas-reliefs in the "Black Monk's Cave" in S.E. Korea, surrounding Shaka's image—that of the Moon-haloed *Kwan-Yin*, the Mother of Buddha-Shaka, presenting a chalice to the foremost of the *ten* Apostles—Peter, who denied, and Judas, who betrayed, his Lord, being omitted? For here Kwan-Yin's attendants have the boat-shaped aureole—symbol of the salvation of shipwrecked souls—which, in the Catacombs, is seen as the *Vesica piscis*—the great Fish with the ship on its back.

At the shrine of Atargatis fish were daily cooked and presented on the table of the goddess, afterwards being consumed by the priests; and Assyrian cylinders show the fish lying on the altar. In the Catacombs are the well-known pictures of the Fish lying upon the sacrificial tripod, in one of which, known as the "Consecration of the Eucharist," the priest stretches his hand over the offering, while the Church, represented by a female figure, stands by in an attitude of intercession.

The Assyrian Dagon-worshipper offered the mystic fish sacrifice to the Fish-god robed in a fish-skin, thus presenting himself as a being kindred to his deity, a custom which is in accordance with the habits of all totemistic clans; and the same idea is expressed in the saying of Tertullian, already quoted, "Christ is the Great Fish, and we are little fishes sharing His nature." The Buddhist monks of Senganji in Korea wear robes embroidered with fishes in their yearly dance at the commemoration of Shaka-Nyorai's birth; and fish-drums are beaten by Japanese and Korean monks as they chant the great Amitabha-sutras and proclaim the Advent of Love and Peace.

Multitudes of little fishes, in crystal, ivory, mother-of-pearl, and precious stones found in the graves of the Catacombs, some of them with holes drilled through the head, so that they might be threaded and worn round the neck, seem to have a parallel in the fish-amulets, or in the nine bells of the white colossus of Miryok Pul with their fish-clappers—each suspended from an equal-armed cross; or the great Fish with a

* See *Asian Cristology and the Mahāyāna*, by Mrs. E. A. Gordon, to which, with other writings by the same author, the present writer is very greatly indebted for many of the parallels suggested in this paper.

pearl* in its mouth; or, again, the carp or dolphin seen in gongs and fish-bells on Far Eastern temple roofs.

It is hardly possible to read the Chinese pilgrim Sung Yun's account of the place "on the west bank of the Indus where Nyorai took the form of a great Fish and came out of the water, for twelve years supporting the people with his flesh"—the great Fish called Mahara, which gave rest and refreshment—without recalling Abercius and his pilgrimage. Think, again, of those Buddhist records of the traditions of Tatha-gata, whose foot-prints—like those of Christ on Olivet, or in the Church of the "Quo Vadis" outside the Gates of Rome—were visible to Chinese pilgrims; who, according to other traditions, brought living water from a rock; to whom, in the form of a serpent, looking, the dying lived; and who, finally, on his departure from the earth, left traces upon a rock as of the scales of a great Fish!

Add to all these the prominence given in Jewish Haggadic literature to the Leviathan in connection with the advent of the Messiah, when "the pious ones shall make a banquet of it,"† and it is impossible not to see some line of thought which, illuminating the minds of ancient sages in times long anterior to the Christian era, at length finds expression in the early Church in days when, seeking a symbol under which to signify their belief in Christ and all that His Sacraments implied, the faithful adopted one which, while full of mystic meaning for themselves, would, on account of its associations with Oriental heathenism, disarm the suspicion of their adversaries.

A. Henderson.

THE CHURCHMANSHIP OF DR. JOHNSON

On October 19, 1769, Boswell asked Johnson if there was not less religion in the nation than formerly; to which the Doctor replied: "I don't know, Sir, that there is." The doubt was unusual, even in his own time. Eleven years before, if it was Johnson's hand that wrote the Dedication to *The Evangelical History of Jesus Christ*,‡ when he felt no hesitation at all:

"That we are fallen upon an age in which corruption is barely not universal, is universally confessed. Venality skulks no longer in the dark, but snatches the bribe in public. . . . Irreligion is not only avowed but boasted; and the pestilence that used to walk in darkness, is now destroying in the noonday."

* The pearl was a recognized symbol of Christ in Syrian usage; though in Chinese Muslim literature it is a symbol of God.

† Referring to Job xli. 6 (Heb.): "And the pious shall make a banquet of it," Rabbi Johanan says that at the time of the resurrection God will give the righteous a feast at which the flesh of the Leviathan shall be served.

‡ Which Croker denies, on the ground that Johnson was no "croaker"!

So severe a view would seem to have the support, twenty years earlier, of Bishop Butler:

"It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat of it, as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."*

And Swift could write, in all seriousness: "It is allowed on all hands that the people of England are more corrupt in their morals than any other nation at this day under the sun."†

It is certainly still customary to think of the eighteenth century as the low-water level of reformed religion, and to treat Montesquieu's "point de religion en Angleterre" as a fairly valid generalization. We remember such bishops as Hoadly, "grasping after pluralities";‡ Gilbert, "feeding more like a pig of Epicurus than the head of a Christian Church";§ Herring, "so stupid, so injudicious, so prostitute a divine";‖ Drummond, who advised a preacher that he would be better employed "preaching the ethics of Socrates than canting about this new birth"; Sherlock, who defended the slave trade on the ground that "embracing of the Gospel does not make the least difference in civil property."¶ We remember Lady Mary's gossip that Walpole was cooking up a Bill "to have *not* taken out of the Commandments and clapped into the Creed," and that Doddington had "very gravely objected that the obstinacy of human nature was such that he feared when they had positive commands to do so, perhaps people would not commit adultery and bear false witness against their neighbours with the readiness and cheerfulness they do at present."

But there is, as Mr. Wickham Legg has reminded us,** another side to the picture; the pure (if somewhat cold) morality

* Butler, *Analogy* (advertisement to the First Edition). Hume openly admitted that he had never read the New Testament with attention.

† A Letter to a Young Clergyman, 1719-20. We need not doubt this to have been an exaggeration. In 1754 a French gentleman said to the Earl of Corke and Orrery: "Monsieur, pour vous dire la verité, nous sommes tous des bons catholiques, mais pour la religion, nous n'en avons point." The Earl comments: "To what country is Religion fled? She has not, undoubtedly, taken up her residence in England." *Letters from Italy*, No. 6.

‡ Fog's *Weekly Journal*, London, 1782, vol. ii., p. 182.

§ Eliz. Montague, *The Queen of the Bluestockings*.

‖ Swift, *Intelligencer*, No. 3. It is only fair to add that the Earl of Corke speaks of Herring as "what a bishop ought to be. Honour and reverence will attend his name while this world lasts."

¶ J. E. V. Crofts, *Enthusiasm*, in Eighteenth-Century Literature: A Miscellany. Clarendon Press, 1909.

** *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement*, 1914.

of the *Spectator*, the *Guardian*, the *Rambler;* the large number and large sale of devotional books; the popularity of sermons; the rise of S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. We have to recognize that the latitudinarian loaf was not entirely unleavened with lumps of real faith and devotion, and that in the welter of fashionable unbelief there persisted a strain of older reverence and discipline. And we have to recognize, too, that by 1769 the influence of John Wesley had made an appreciable difference in the religious life of English people, without, at that time, threatening the ultimate secession of Methodism from the Church—which would certainly have alienated Johnson's sympathies. The two men seem to have met for the first time in 1783, but Johnson must have known and approved Wesley's work for many years before. There was, indeed, much in common between them; the religion of both owed its first intensity to Law, the Non-Juror; and it is probable that if they were alive to-day we should find them worshipping neither with official Anglicanism nor with the Wesleyan sectaries, but with Anglo-Catholics.

Sir Joshua Reynolds could assure Johnson on his death-bed that he had been the greatest champion of Christ in his age. If he had lived to carry out a project of his later years, to write in defence of Christianity, we should doubtless have had the greatest work of its kind in the eighteenth century; but, as it is, we must look to his life and conversation to understand the justice of Reynolds's tribute. There we find that his religious training had begun in his earliest years with a very strong bias towards "High Church" principles. His father, in religion and politics, was a zealous royalist, and took the child Samuel, at the age of three, to hear Sacheverell preach in Lichfield Cathedral. The boy's mother, however, would seem to have been strict in her notions of Sunday observance; Johnson remembered it as a "heavy day," and that his mother confined him to the house and made him read *The Whole Duty of Man*. His earliest religious idea came from her—the idea of heaven and hell. And she made him learn by heart collects out of the Prayer Book.

About the age of nine, he confesses that he fell "into an inattention to religion," and used to walk in the fields when he should have been at church. At fourteen he became a "lax talker against religion" till the time of his going to Oxford, at nineteen. There, a year later, he read Law's *Serious Call*, and the effect of this, together with an illness, was to bring back religion, which he never again lost.

This religion was uncompromisingly "High Church"; but we must remember that the label did not, in those days, have

quite the same accidents of meaning that it popularly has now. Swift writes:

"Sometime after the revolution the distinction of *high* and *low* church came in, which was raised by the Dissenters in order to break up the Church-party by dividing the members into *high* and *low*; and the opinion raised, that the *high* joined with the Papists, inclined the *low* to fall in with the Dissenters."*

The distinction was to a great extent co-terminous with the political parties of Whig and Tory, and was involved with political issues of the first importance. It did not always represent any real differences in religion; but was primarily a badge "to distinguish friends from foes." Swift himself was a "tantivy,"† and he states that the majority in the House of Commons were of the High Church party. This meant little more than that they were prepared to uphold the doctrines of indefeasible hereditary right, of unlimited non-resistance, and of inherent ecclesiastical authority. "The Church of England," remarks Swift,‡ "is no creature of the civil power, either as to its polity or doctrine." And they regarded Popery itself as a less evil than "fanaticism." Swift speaks for himself as a High Churchman:

"The Pope, or Calvin, he'd oppose,
And thought they both were equal foes;
That Church and State had suffered more
By Calvin than the scarlet whore:
Thought Popish and fanatic zeal
Both bitter foes to Britain's weal.
The Pope would of our faith bereave us,
But still our monarchy w'd leave us—
Not so the vile fanatic crew;
That ruined Church and monarch too."§

Before the end of the century this political connotation became less absolute, as the Hanoverian dynasty became more firmly established, and the danger from Jacobite and Cromwellian faded away. Archbishop Potter, in 1737, was both a High Churchman and a Whig; and in 1790 Bishop Horsley defined a High Churchman as one who "acknowledges in the sacred character something more divine than may belong to the mere hired servant of the State or of the laity," and regards their services as "something more than a part to be gravely played in the drama of human politics."

Horsley was a member of the Essex Street Club, of which Dr. Johnson was another, and drew up the rules. They were agreed about the supernatural sanctions of the Church and her

* *Examiner*, No. 43, May 31, 1711.
† *The Protestant Post Boy*, newspaper, October, 1711.
‡ *Remarks upon a Book Intituled, The Rights of the Christian Church*, 1708.
§ *The Life and Character of Dr. Swift*, by himself.

Orders, and Johnson did not hesitate to assert the necessity of apostolic succession, or at least the danger of being without it. It is well known that he would not enter a Presbyterian church when he was in Scotland, but that in France he attended Roman Catholic services. His attitude toward the Roman Church is especially significant; he went so far as to say to Boswell in 1784: "I would be a Papist if I could . . . an obstinate rationality prevents me." There were very few points of Catholic doctrine and practice for which he could not make a defence. Of the invocation of saints, he said: "Though I do not think it authorized, it appears to me that the Communion of Saints in the Creed means the communion with the saints in heaven, as connected with the Holy Catholic Church." He thought it "safer" not to practise it. Of praying for the departed, he said: "It is a very harmless doctrine. . . . If it be once established that there are souls in Purgatory, it is as proper to pray for them, as for our brethren of mankind who are yet in this life." He did pray, not without some nervousness, for the souls of his wife, his mother, his father, his brother, and Henry Thrale. Of the Mass: "There is no idolatry in the Mass. They believe God to be there, and they adore Him." Of Confession: "Why, I don't know, but that is a good thing. The Scripture says, 'Confess your faults one to another,' and the priests confess as well as the laity. . . . Their absolution is only upon repentance, and often upon penance also. You (Boswell) think your sins may be forgiven without penance, upon repentance alone." In one case he speaks of Communion in one kind as "criminal," but in another he defends it as parallel with the substitution of sprinkling for immersion in Baptism.

We do not, in Johnson's conversation, hear much of these Catholic beliefs and practices in the English Church; but they were certainly not unknown. Swift quotes Burnet to the effect that "auricular confession, priestly absolution, and the sacrifice of the Mass" had made great progress in England.* James I., Charles I., and Anne went regularly to confession, as did many of their subjects; representative Churchmen like Cosin and Donne recommended confession before every Communion, In Laud's time, a preacher before the University of Cambridge had been called to account for asserting the necessity of confession to a priest; but a majority of the Heads of Colleges decided that he had taught nothing contrary to the doctrine of the English Church. And that the Eucharist is a sacrifice was the plain teaching of a great many writers: of Robert Nelson, whose *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts* is said to have had

* A preface to the Rt. Rev. Dr. Burnet, Bishop of Sarum's Introduction to the third volume of *The Reformation in the Church of England.*

a sale second only to the Bible itself; of Thomas Wilson, of Samuel Hardy, of Bishop William Cleaver, of Jones of Nayland, of John Wesley, who writes in 1745, "we believe there is . . . an outward sacrifice offered (in the Christian Church) by men authorized to act as ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Boswell himself says that the Anglican formularies "maintain a mysterious belief in more than a mere commemoration of the death of Christ."

Johnson was a devout but infrequent communicant. In spite of a resolution in 1779 to receive the Sacrament three times a year, he seems, with one or two exceptions, to have done so only at Easter. On his death-bed, and once before in a time of illness, he received it at home. It is somewhat surprising that he did not scruple to break his fast with the inevitable cup of tea; but it is still more surprising that he commended Boswell, a Presbyterian, in receiving Communion in an English Church on at least one occasion. He may have found a precedent in the action of one Fr. Fulgentius, who (as he notes in his life of Fr. Paul Sarpi) "made no scruple of administering to Dr. Duncombe, an English gentleman that fell sick at Venice, the communion in both kinds according to the Common Prayer which he had with him in Italian."

Apart from the fast before Communion, Johnson's practice would do credit to many Catholics to-day. In the *Rambler* of Easter Eve, 1751, he had written in defence of fasting:

> "Austerity is the proper antidote for indulgence; and the diseases of the mind as well as the body are cured by contraries."

His normal practice on Good Friday was to have nothing but one cup of "very small tea," without milk. Once Boswell records a cup of coffee in the evening, as a "compliment to Mr. Thrale," and once a cross-bun, to prevent faintness. During the whole of Passion Week (*i.e.*, Holy Week), in 1766, he ate no meat. As to his observance of Fridays and Lent, we have no record; but some sort of fasting was so far from unusual at these times that we cannot argue from Boswell's silence. We cannot imagine Johnson writing, as Swift did, "I wish you a merry Lent. I hate Lent."

In almsgiving he had an old-fashioned simplicity. "He loved the poor," says Mrs. Piozzi, "as I never yet saw anyone else do, with an earnest desire to make them happy. 'What signifies,' says someone, 'giving half-pence to common beggars? They only lay it out in gin or tobacco.' 'And why should they be denied such sweeteners of their existence?' says Johnson." "He frequently gave all the silver in his pocket to the poor," says his friend, the Rev. Dr. Maxwell. To condemn this sort

of almsgiving he called the mark of a true Whig, and Fielding would have been glad to agree with him, as a Whig himself, who describes it as "a kind of bounty that is a crime against the public."

We are not surprised to find that Johnson was diligent and devout in prayer. At one time he projected a collection of the best prayers, which should certainly have included some of his own; but at the same time he asserted that there were none to equal the collects of the Prayer Book. He maintained the usefulness of fixed times and seasons for prayer, and of retirement and solitude. Number 110 of the *Rambler* might have been written to support the Retreat Movement. Of the monastic life he had much to say; he "thought worse of the vices of retirement than of those of society," and that such retirement was justifiable only for those who had already done their "duty to society," and those who were invincibly scrupulous or too weak to "stem the temptations of public life." But nevertheless, the religious life appealed to him powerfully: "I never read of a hermit, but in imagination I kiss his feet; never of a monastery, but I could fall on my knees and kiss the pavement."

Outward reverence was a real part of Dr. Johnson's religion. "Incorporated minds," he wrote, "will always feel some inclination towards exterior acts and ritual observances." He commended the practice of a gentleman who raised his hat in passing a church, and while visiting the ruined Chapel of the Virgin in the Island of Rasay, he said, "I look with reverence upon every place that has been set apart for religion," and kept off his hat all the time he was within the walls of the ruin. And on the same occasion he vented one of his fierce and frequent denunciations of the neglect of sacred places: "The malignant influence of Calvinism has blasted ceremony and decency together." On the same theme he wrote to Mrs. Thrale: "By the active zeal of Protestant devotion almost all the chapels have sunk into ruin." The dirtiness of Scotch churches was indeed proverbial. Bishop Horne tells a story of an English lady who offered to attend the kirk if she might have the pew swept and lined. "The pew swept and lined!" exclaimed the minister's wife; "my husband would think it downright popery." Johnson found a similar state of things in Wales, and it was frequent enough in England, especially in the North; but that it was all the fault of Calvinism is disproved by Blessed John Eudes' account of the churches in France at about the same date:

"Allez dans les églises; vous en verrez plusieurs au dehors environnées d'ordure et de puanteur; au dedans tapisées de toiles d'araignées, pavées de boue et de poudre . . . les autels denués d'ornements et couverts de

poussière, les prêtres offrir le redoutable sacrifice avec des aubes et des chasubles toutes dechirées, des corporaux et des purificatoires quelquefois si sales qu'ils font mal au cœur; des calices d'étain et tout noirs; le très Saint Sacrement dans un ciboire de même étoffe et dans un chétif tabernacle tout couvert et rempli de poudre et d'ordure, sans lampe et sans lumière et sans aucune marque de religion."

We shall not be surprised to find that Johnson believed in the observance of Sunday in a way that seemed as strict to the fashionable license of his day as it seemed profane to the sabbatarianism of the "enthusiasts." He would have it kept "not with rigid severity and gloom," but "with a gravity and simplicity of behaviour"; with relaxation, but not with levity. He whimsically said that you might take a walk on Sunday, but not throw stones at birds; and his own preference was to read nothing on Sunday but what was theological. On his deathbed he requested Lord Eldon to attend public worship every Sunday, and Sir Joshua Reynolds not to paint on that day. Number 80 of the *Rambler*, written by the daughter of the Archdeacon of Berkshire, but published under Johnson's editorship, personifies Sunday, and gives an amusing picture of the various ways in which various people spent the day.

"Some will never receive me but in bed, where they spend at least half of the time I have to stay with them; and others are so monstrously ill-bred as to take physic on purpose when they have reason to expect me. Those who keep upon terms of more politeness with me, are generally so cold and constrained in their behaviour that I cannot but perceive myself an unwelcome guest. Even in my best days there were persons who thought me too demure and grave. I must forsooth by all means be instructed by foreign masters, and taught to dance and play. . . . I fell next into the hands of a very different set. . . . They robbed me of every innocent ornament. . . . They blacked my face, and covered me all over with a habit of mourning. . . . I was now obliged to spend my whole life in hearing sermons; nor permitted so much as to smile upon any occasion. In this melancholy disguise I became a perfect bugbear to all children and young folks. . . . I equally hate lazy idleness and hurry. I would everywhere be welcomed at a tolerably early hour with decent good-humour and gratitude. . . . Some time I must have *tête-à-tête* with my kind entertainers, and the rest of my visit should be spent in pleasant walks, . . . in such discourse as I shall naturally dictate, or in reading some few selected out of those numberless books that are dedicated to me."

We may take that as representing Johnson's view of Sunday, as against the gloom of the Puritan idea on the one hand, and on the other, the cynical frivolity expressed by a writer in the *Connoisseur* of July 25, 1754: "Going to church may indeed be reckoned among our Sunday amusements."

For Johnson himself these questions, however reasonably he might treat of them, would have solved themselves by an

appeal to loyalty. To the modern Anglo-Catholic he may seem to have been, in some points, somewhat lax; but it was a laxity of charitable tolerance, and not of vague undenominationalism; and there was a fairly sharp line beyond which he could not admit even tolerance to be charitable. Tolerance "of what was tolerable" he was prepared to give; but he was not prepared to grant that everything was tolerable. The ancients, he said, disputed with good humour about religion because they were not in earnest about it; to be in earnest is to draw the line somewhere. Beyond that line Johnson's good humour could not be counted upon. Like St. John, he would not have bathed under the same roof with Cerinthus. An infidel was more detestable than a man notoriously guilty of atrocious crime, because "the infidel would be guilty of any crime if he were inclined to it." He called a young lady who became a Quaker an "odious wench"; and when Mrs. Knowles hoped that they would at any rate meet in heaven, he replied: "Meet her! I never desire to meet fools anywhere." The Great Bear could growl on occasion. But Thackeray's praise is apt and just:

"I hold old Johnson to be the great supporter of the British monarchy and Church during the last age—better than whole benches of bishops, better than Pitts, Norths, and the great Burke himself. . . . Johnson was revered as a sort of oracle; and the oracle declared for Church and King."

W. S. Porter.

[Notes on Articles:

P. 303: Canon Richmond quotes St. John vii. 37, 38 freely. It is worth drawing attention to the fact that both Dr. Rendel Harris and Dr. Burney (*Expositor*, September and November, 1920) punctuate after ἐμέ, and believe κοιλίας to hide an Aramaic original meaning 'throne' (R. H.) or 'fountain' (B.). The utterance will then run: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and let him that believeth on me drink. As the scripture said, Out of his throne (*or* fountain) shall flow rivers of living water." The allusion is to the bubbling stream of the Spirit issuing from God's throne or spring (*cf.* Zech. xiv. 8; Jer. ii. 13, iii. 17; Ez. xlvii. 1-12; Isa. lv. 1. See also Dr. Bindley in *Expositor* for December, 1920).

P. 311: Professor Turner's allusion to the neglect of the appeal to History in earlier Protestantism is noted in Lord Morley's *Oliver Cromwell* as a marked characteristic of Milton's *Areopagitica*.—Ed.]

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Rev. Peter Katz writes from Fahrenbach (Baden) in Germany to correct a misunderstanding which might arise from the last of the Notes and Comments in our November number (p. 271). He wrote the review of Dr. Linderholm's prayer book in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* to which we alluded, and points out that the allusion to the *Grey Book* occurs in Dr. Otto's contribution, and not (he believes) in Dr. Linderholm's own compilation. Our correspondent observes of the Swedish original that "it is too protestant even to me." We may add that for 1914 on p. 271 of our November number should be read 1924. We are grateful to our correspondent for his note.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH CONGRESS.

Sir,

So far I have not noticed in Theology any mention of the Church Congress held in Edinburgh, October 7-9, 1924—an event small in one way, yet memorable as the first Church Congress which has taken place in Scotland for fifty years, and as being in itself a most remarkable and impressive gathering.

The papers and speeches are to be given in full in the official Report,* which readers of Theology will find worthy of a place beside the Reports of any of our English Congresses, Anglo-Catholic or otherwise. What I would like to lay stress upon here is the witness borne by the Congress to the spiritual and intellectual strength of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and to its capacity for expressing the religious genius of the Scottish people. In this connection three things seemed to me specially noticeable:

(*a*) The spiritual atmosphere of the Congress. "As good as an Anglo-Catholic Congress," someone said, and yet different. Scottish people are not demonstrative, and the absence of any element of excitement only deepened the impression of intense spiritual reality. Perhaps in no respect was this more marked than in the hymns, both in the choice made and in the singing.

(*b*) The intellectual appreciation of very stiff theological papers. English audiences are patient, but do not as a rule give such an impression of absorbed interest and attention. If it is true that the Scot rates education more highly than we do, and is more at home in theology, that is certainly a valuable asset to the Church in Scotland.

(*c*) The strong sense of nationality in the Congress. The mere fact of meeting in the Free Church Assembly Hall, with the figure of John Knox dominating the entrance, could not but appeal to one's imagination and historic sense (interpret it how you will), and stronger still was the appeal of the opening hymn, "O God of Bethel," sung by people who have the old Scottish psalms and paraphrases in their very blood. I am not a Scot, but it thrilled me all over; and when later in the Congress Canon

* 1s. R. Grant, Princes Street, Edinburgh.

Laurie pleaded with intense earnestness that the Holy Eucharist be made the centre of corporate and individual worship, one felt that it came fitly from one who represented that "Jacobite stronghold," Old St. Paul's, and spoke as a Scottish Churchman to his own people.

We in England are learning much nowadays about the Eastern Church and our own daughter Churches overseas, but we do not, as a rule, know much about the Church in Scotland. We think of it, if at all, as a small and insignificant body, and when we go North for a holiday, speak of "going to the English Church" as though it were a kind of alien thing, like a Swiss chaplaincy. But the Congress has shown that this insignificant Church possesses individuality, intellect, and spiritual power, and in the battle for Catholic Christianity we may well be proud and thankful to have such an ally so near, and to be linked closely with the great Saints of the North who have left such a lasting mark on the religious life of our islands.

E. M. Bullock.

P.S.—It should be mentioned that not only did the Congress itself give a warm welcome to those who came from England to read papers, but the *Scotsman*, that staunch Presbyterian paper, took great pains to report them well, and devoted considerable space to special Congress articles. If in one article Father Waggett was described as "a sandy-haired lad," it was far from intending any disrespect!

NOTE

SOME WARNINGS FROM ROMAN LITURGIOLOGISTS.

In recent years, and especially since the revision of our Book of Common Prayer came within the circle of practical politics, many devout members of the Church of England have advocated changes which, in varying degrees approximate to the practice of the Roman Communion; and it is our wisdom to examine such proposals without prejudice.

It seems, therefore, advisable to call attention to some statements of learned members of that Communion which are made with admirable freedom from prejudice, and for the most part have their origin in historical research. They will tend, the present writer thinks, to express a reasonable call for consideration, and for a pause before we press for some of these changes. It may be going beyond the evidence to say, as is not uncommonly said, that some English Churchmen desire teaching and practices from which wise Romans would now be gladly free. But under any circumstances the works from which this article makes quotations deserve to be widely known among our clergy, though they are familiar to students of Liturgiology.

I.—The Daily Offices of Mattins and Evensong.

In view of the depreciation of such public devotions which has found not infrequent expression in recent times, the following extract is significant, from a work entitled *The Roman Breviary, its Sources and History*, by Dom Jules Baudot, Benedictine of Farnborough, translated from the French by a priest of the Diocese of Westminster, London. Catholic Truth Society, 1909. The translator in his preface writes:

"It is with the hope that English layfolk will learn to value more highly, and understand more clearly, the beauty, dignity, and antiquity of the Church's public liturgical prayer that this little book has been translated into English. While there are so many books of private devotion—of various degrees of excellence and authority—the one devotional book to be used above all others, which has grown with the Church's growth and nourished the devotion of her saints, which is intimately bound up with her history and full of her spirit, seems to be forgotten, to be set aside as dry and archaic, or to be regarded as the private property of clergy and religious. Yet there is no book richer in treasures of devotion, endowed with higher authority, or more capable of producing in the souls of those who use it *digne, attente, ac devote*, a devotional temper at once hearty and strong and truly Catholic."

It is hardly necessary to remind readers that the original aim of these offices was the devotional use of the Psalter and the reading of Scriptures: and the work here quoted records *inter alia* the efforts to secure this aim from encroachments or corruptions of various kinds. In one period "a dislike of the spiritual nourishment offered by the Holy Scripture became general" (p. 121), at another the Pope "was deeply impressed by the fact that the Roman Breviary had lost its ancient simplicity" (p. 206). Thus the author's commendation of the Breviary to the laity, and historical record of it, suggest food for thought to those English Churchmen who are inclined to attach little value to our Mattins and Evensong whether in their present or in some revised form, such as is now under discussion.

II.—The Inaudible Reciting of Prayers in the Liturgy.

The origin of the practice is obscure. Dr. Adrian Fortescue writes (*The Mass, a Study of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 327):

"In the Eastern liturgies much more than in the West the celebrant prays silently (μυστικῶς), while the people (generally with the deacon) say other prayers aloud. The reason for this in general is to shorten the service. Originally undoubtedly everything was said aloud, first one part, then the other. The desire to hasten made the celebrant begin his prayers before the people had finished theirs, instead of waiting; and so, of course, he had to say them in a low voice. It seems most probable that in the West the same motive began the practice of praying secretly. There are obvious cases of this still. Few priests wait till the choir has finished: 'Sed libera nos a malo' and 'Et cum Spiritu tuo' at the Pax before they go on with their prayers. So apparently at the Canon. The Sanctus sung by the choir took some time; meanwhile the celebrant went on with the prayer, which in that case had to be said silently. So it became a custom, a tradition, and later mystic reasons were found for it."

Mgr. Duchesne has another theory of its origin (*Christian Worship*, translated by M. L. McClure. Fourth Edition, 1912, p. 117):

"I do not include under the term liturgical chant the recitative or intoning of the lections or such of the prayers as are said aloud. This practice may be very ancient. It was necessarily introduced as soon as the Christian assemblies became very large, and thus rendered it difficult for the officiating minister or reader to make himself heard. The flections of the voice served for a scansion of the text and thus gave more relief

to the intonation. But the slight modulations resulting from this were more akin to accentuated reading than to chanting properly so called.

"It was for the same reason—namely, the difficulty of maintaining a high intonation in a large building—that the custom must have arisen of pronouncing in a low voice certain formularies which were evidently intended in the first instance to be heard by everybody. There are two of such in the Roman Mass, viz., the prayer called *Secreta* before the Preface, and the Canon from the *Sanctus* onwards. According to the Eastern usage many other formularies of prayer are said in a low voice by the officiating minister. But in every country these formularies end in what the Greeks call an ecphonesis (ἐκφώνησις), that is, in a raised inflection of the voice at the end, so that the congregation may respond with *Amen*."

Whichever theory be adopted, the modern practice receives no commendation from the source to which it may be traced. If Dr. Fortescue be right, it arose from a reluctance to give time to God's service; if Mgr. Duchesne, it is in direct contradiction of the principles of Eucharistic worship in the Apostolic Church and in the Church of the time when the practice arose which was converted later into inaudible recitation. As we read these learned and devout historians we seem to hear a sigh for freedom from the modern custom concerning which as men devoted to historical truth they record the results of their investigations.

III.—"Simplicity" in Liturgical Worship.

On this subject there is much to be learnt from the well-known essay on "The Genius of the Roman Rite" by the late Mr. Edmund Bishop, printed in *Essays on Ceremonial* in the Library of Liturgiology, edited by Vernon Staley.

Taking as the most convenient example the Roman Missal, Mr. Bishop separates out from the whole complex or amalgam the genuine Roman elements. He puts aside as foreign elements introduced later the Asperges and everything that precedes the priest's ascent to the altar, the Kyrie Eleison, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Creed, the prayers accompanying the acts of the offertory, the censing of the altar, as being late and French, and one or two other elements, and summarizes the early Roman Mass of the middle of the fifth century. What can be more simple? he asks (p. 293).

"We do not realize at once how much of added and imposing ceremonial is involved in the addition, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of the single act of the Elevation of the Host and Chalice, with its accompanying lights and torches, censing, bell-ringings, and genuflections. Next, all ideas of censing the altar, the elements for the sacrifice, or persons, are alien to the native Roman rite . . . ritual pomp (was) confined to two moments: first, the entry of the celebrant into the church and up to the altar; secondly, in connection with the singing of the gospel." The lengthy directions at another point "are not ceremonial, but . . . simply practical, purely practical, to ensure good order or to prevent blundering" (p. 296).

"The element which can be identified as Roman is simple and the elaboration is a foreign graft on the plain original stock."

He proceeds to unfold the history of the later additions to the native Roman rite free "from all that can be called sentiment and effusiveness

or imagination, or mystery." He holds that much was due to Charles the Great, and to "loud and strenuous advocacy on the part of individuals of strict Roman observance," as "a singularly convenient means for pressing on others, under cover of the august Roman name, private preferences" (pp. 301, 303).

So Rome ended at last in accepting the Mass book thus compiled in France. The native Roman books and rites were accommodated to the more devout, or effusive or imaginative genius of the nations which had one and all adopted them. At the present time, that effusive, affective and devotional spirit which made itself felt in the Middle Ages in modifications of the liturgical books themselves, finds a new field of operation in the "development of what we call, to distinguish them from the fixed official services, 'devotions.'"

These "devotions," and the spirit which gives rise to them, Mr. Bishop does not condemn. He keeps strictly to the subject of his essay, as we should expect. And he writes at the close, "If I had to indicate in two or three words only the main characteristics which go to make up the essential genius of the Roman rite, I should say that those characteristics were essentially soberness and sense."

The aim of this reference to Mr. Bishop's most valuable essay and the quotations from it, is not to claim the devout and learned writer as one who sighs for simplicity, but in order to call the attention of those who are concerned with revision of our own Offices to the history which it relates and the admirable spirit which permeates the paper.

It will warn us that simplicity, soberness, and sense may not meet all demands, and that picturesque elaboration may be sensuous and lack sobriety and self-control. And it makes quite clear the greatness of the changes which the Middle Ages worked till the Roman Mass book assumed a form and embodied rites which Pope Hadrian, who sent it to Charles the Great, would not have recognized as his own (*cf.* p. 303). In particular we may here notice Mr. Bishop's reference to the effect of the introduction of the Elevation.

IV

For side by side with that change with which Mr. Edmund Bishop's essay dealt in 1899, is another, no doubt closely related to it, which may be noticed next.

In 1911, about twelve years after his essay on the Genius of the Roman Rite, the same distinguished liturgiologist, in some "Liturgical Comments and Memoranda," which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April, 1911, vol. xii., pp. 384 *ff*), has occasion to refer to Chrysostom's Homily 21 on Acts, delivered at Constantinople in A.D. 401. It raises "questions," he considers, "which will prove to be of crucial importance for the development of Christian liturgy, and to touch the very principles of divine worship and the rationale of the Eucharistic Service itself" (p. 392).

"The great problem presented by the history of Christian worship at large . . . is surely this: How is it that the primitive Christian Eucharist described by St. Paul, the character of which the very abuses reproved by him only serve to emphasize, has become the High Mass of the basilicas of Rome or the Cathedrals of St. Petersburg?" Mr. Bishop holds that

the teaching of St. Chrysostom played an important part in "change." "The future was hidden from his (St. Chrysostom's) eyes; and doubtless (to judge from other utterances of his) the eventual resultant was the last condition of things that he would have desired to bring about" (p. 395). In the great Bishop of Constantinople he sees in principle already that type of Christian worship which has become so dominant and is indicated by the expression "the devotion of the Mass."

Here we have simply a reference to the great problem, and an indication of the extent of the enormous change which has so widely come to pass from the primitive Christian Eucharist of St. Paul and the later Eucharist of St. Chrysostom.

Another learned member of the Roman Church, whose death also all who know his books must lament, the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue, deals with one very influential element in the change. In his *The Mass, a Study of the Roman Liturgy* (Longmans, 1914), after treating of the Elevation—and incidentally remarking (p. 338), "It is a late mediæval ceremony . . . It began in France and was adopted at Rome rather later"—he examines its origin and the origin of the custom of the ringing of the bell which apparently arose from it. He ends his section with the following words:

"It is true that this mediæval ceremony of the Elevation has tended to become a new centre of gravity for the Mass. It is possible to exaggerate its importance. A rite unknown till the twelfth century cannot be of first importance in any liturgy. We must teach our people that the essence of the Mass is not the elevation, but consecration and communion" (p. 345).

These are bold words, and, as English Churchmen hold, most true: and in conjunction with the more reserved statement of Mr. Edmund Bishop are most significant, especially for those who are considering the revision of our Book of Common Prayer, and its Eucharistic Office.

If the writings which have furnished the material for this paper be read, it will be seen that three changes have taken place which are very closely connected, and which go very deep, and that they may be expressed briefly as follows:

1. The change from the Church's evident intention that certain formularies in the Eucharistic Office should be heard by everybody present, to the practice of rendering these formularies inaudible. (Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 118; Fortescue, *op cit.*, p. 326.)

2. The change of the Roman Mass book, its form and rites, as known to Pope Hadrian, into one which he would not have recognized as his own. (E. Bishop, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, p. 303.)

3. The change in the Eucharist which was the last condition of things that St. Chrysostom would have desired to bring about (E. Bishop, *J. T. S.* xii., p. 398), or, to express it otherwise, the change by which the centre of gravity was shifted from its early position to another. (Fortescue, *op. cit.*, p. 345.)

We think that the occurrence of these changes and their import "will be evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scriptures and ancient Authors."

ARTHUR M. KNIGHT (BP.)

REVIEWS

THE DECALOGUE (The Warburton Lectures, 1919-23). By R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d. net.

Archdeacon Charles has undertaken to treat the subject of these lectures from three standpoints—the critical, the historical, and the practical. The critical study takes the form of an Introduction and he devotes fifty-eight pages to it, and out of these more than twenty are given to the Nash papyrus of the Decalogue, which was discovered in 1902. While written towards the end of the first century A.D. or the beginning of the second, it represents, in Dr. Charles's judgment, a form of the Hebrew text which circulated in Egypt as early as 200 B.C. Comparing it with the recensions which we possess in Exodus xx. and Deuteronomy v., we find, in the main, a general agreement between the three forms, but also certain differences in important features. At the top of its genealogical tree stands the Mosaic Decalogue, each commandment consisting of one short clause (*c.* 1320-1300 B.C.). This form received some small additions in the Fourth, Tenth, and perhaps Third Commandments, before it was incorporated in E (*c.* 800-750 B.C.). From E two separate forms were developed. *The earlier found in Deuteronomy* received a large addition in the Second Commandment (*i.e.*, Deut. v. 8-10), in the Fourth (*i.e.*, Deut. v. 15), and in the Fifth. The later form, now found in Exodus, took over several of these Deuteronomic additions in (about) the fifth century B.C. Next a mixture of these two forms arose in Egypt, to which the Hebrew archetype used by LXX., *c.* 300 B.C., was due. From a further mixture of this archetype with the "Exodus" text arose the text of the Nash papyrus.

Dr. Charles, with many scholars, argues that the Deuteronomic form is earlier than that of Exodus, which embodies a comparatively late interpolation (Exod. xx. 11) based on Gen. ii. 2 and Exod. xxxi. 17 (both belonging to the Priestly Code).

The historical study promises to estimate the meaning and measure of obedience assigned to the Ten Commandments at various stages in the history of Israel and Judah.

The author's chief aim, however, has been the practical one of "interpreting the Decalogue on the spiritual and ethical lines laid down in the New Testament, and applying its lessons to the crying needs of our own day."

In the opinion of the reviewer the thesis of the book has not

been made good. Dr. Charles suffers now and then from that disturber of Irish wisdom—a self-conscious fear of being dull, which causes him disastrously to interrupt his discourse just when it is becoming most wise. For, had he devoted his lectures to the critical study of the Decalogue and its place in the religion of Israel, and to all the baffling problems that confront the student concerning its origin, and given us a historical sketch of the attempts of scholars—from Kuenen and Ewald down to the present day—at solving them, instead of discussing at such length the Nash papyrus, which has but little bearing on the main issue, then we might have had a standard work on the Decalogue similar to his *Commentary to the Book of Revelation*. Dr. Charles with his reputation as a Biblical scholar, having chosen a subject of great importance and extreme difficulty, disappoints us. To the student the critical part is unsatisfactory; for, with the exception of the detailed discussion of the Nash text, which is very welcome, he finds nothing new, and Dr. Charles's dogmatic assertions concerning problems upon which expert opinion is divided are most irritating.

The main portion of the book (272 pp.) is homiletical, and as a preacher Dr. Charles is not arresting. His style is garrulous, and the manner in which his fierce attacks on the Roman Church crop up in almost every lecture is reminiscent of Mr. Dick and his Memorial. Dr. Charles says on p. 249: "The man who surrenders himself to party spirit or party strife cannot fail to break the Commandment (ninth) alike by what he says and what he leaves unsaid. For this spirit prevents men from seeing what is good in their opponents, while it exaggerates what is evil. It does not set right and truth in the first place, but party interest, and in so doing bears false witness before the tribunal of public opinion. . . . They think that they are doing God service in blasting the reputation of their opponents . . . This Commandment is in itself a recognition of the immeasurable influence of the moral judgments which men are pronouncing every day upon each other." These are wise words and very forcibly expressed. After them I must be allowed to quote further from Dr. Charles, "Truth of thought is beyond the reach of those who submit to the jurisdiction of a so-called infallible authority." "If an infallible authority makes it 'the duty' of its votaries 'to lie in certain cases' it cannot prevent this vice from making inroads into every province of moral life," "mendacity must more and more become one of the chief assets of an infallible Church." "Accordingly, when the adherents of such a system have their eyes opened to the falsity of any part of it, they too readily jettison the whole and with

it their belief in truth itself. Disasters of this nature are frequent in the Roman Church; seldom in the Anglican hitherto." "Again, when once men vote themselves out of the kingdom of truth and freedom, they proceed to exult in their servitude and glory in their shame. Unconscious of their degradation they become the most ardent proselytizers, and stop at no measures which may constrain their neighbours to embrace the same yoke of bondage. They manifest the most unblushing intolerance."

Those who object to capital punishment or believe war to be wrong in all circumstances are "moral perverts and degenerates"; this evidently includes the Quakers. On p. 214 Dr. Charles says, "The school of Hillel, however, which represented the accepted view in Judaism, held that the husband need not assign any reason whatever; that any act on her part which displeased him entitled him, without the intervention of any court, to give her a bill of divorce and dismiss her. This loose teaching of the school of Hillel prevailed down to the eleventh century of the Christian era." He evidently founded this upon the discussion in the talmudical Tractate Gittin between the Schools of Shammai and of Hillel. To take the words "even if she spoilt his food" literally is unfair. The metaphor, as do similar metaphors in the Talmud, points to indecency of conduct. Against Dr. Charles's quotations I would quote, "The very altar sheds tears when a man divorces the wife of his youth" (Gittin, 90), and many other instances could be quoted from Rabbinic literature to show that "the Oriental view of women that prevails amongst the Jews" is not that base one which Dr. Charles presents it to be.

What help might have been given to the modern Christian with his problems about the Personality of God; the degrees of Revelation; Transcendence and Immanence, etc., by a powerful exposition of the First Commandment! Dr. Charles's dry "You are aware, my brethren, that the Decalogue is preserved in two different forms, in the twentieth chapter of Exodus and the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy. Both have clearly undergone editorial changes" touches none of these problems nor the heart of the seeker. While "the divine name Yahweh may be unfamiliar to some of you, though you are all familiar with the shortened form 'Yah' in the Psalms. Hence I would call the attention of such to the fact that the word Jehovah, which is used in our English version in place of Yahweh, is a *vox nulla*—that is, no real word at all. Taken at best, it arises from a mispronunciation of the divine name. Such a pronunciation of the divine name was not introduced till A.D. 1520, or about 2,800 years after the Mosaic legislation" is most exaspera-

ting. Is the book intended for scholars? Then this is all rather a glimpse into the obvious. Is it intended only for those who know nothing of Biblical criticism? Then why have such a critical apparatus in the Introduction without any explanations? The date 1520, by the way, is incorrect and should be 1278.

He sketches, in the lectures on the Second Commandment, the development of image worship in the Christian Church, with strong denunciations of mariolatry and the cult of image worship in the Roman and Eastern Churches, and compares the use of the crucifix with the golden calf. This latter smacks of Kensitism, to say the least objectionable thing about it; the vehemence of the language cannot but evoke criticism, and it all offers painful reading. And does not Dr. Charles know that, according to the Second Council of Nicæa, *worship* (λατρεία) pertains to the Divine Nature alone? (*Definitio conc. Nic.* II.; *Mansi. conc.* XIII., 377.)

But all this criticism must not be understood to imply that the book is without interest and value. It is often suggestive and stimulating even while it provokes. And in a certain sense it could be said of it what the late Professor Cheyne said concerning Delitzsch's *System einer biblischen Psychologie*, that he attempted too much, but that there was more to be learned from Delitzsch when he was wrong than from ten ordinary men when they were right.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

THE KING'S TOUCH

LES ROIS THAUMATURGES: ÉTUDE SUR LE CARACTÈRE SURNATUREL ATTRIBUÉ À LA PUISSANCE ROYALE PARTICULIÈREMENT EN FRANCE ET EN ANGLETERRE. Par Marc Bloch, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1924. 12s. 6d. net.

This volume, the fruit of minute research combined with a rare power of lucid exposition, deals with a topic which has engaged the attention not only of theologians and physicians, but of historians and numismatists and even novelists and poets. Authoritative work, from various standpoints, on the healing power of kings has been published in recent years by Dr. Raymond Crawfurd and Miss Helen Farquhar in England, and by a long list of writers in France, Germany, and America. But there was room for a book which should bring together the results of previous research and should elucidate the ideas that lie behind outworn beliefs. Such beliefs have left curious

traces even in our own day. As late as 1903 a Ross-shire shepherd suffering from scrofula lamented that he had never been able to approach Queen Victoria, for he was sure she would have cured him: all that he could do now was to go to Lochaber and try his fortune with a healer there who was a seventh son. In Professor Bloch's 500 pages of text with their ample footnotes, full bibliography, and admirable index, there is a store of detail concerning those "strangely-visited people, all swoln and ulcerous, pitiful to the eye," who not only in Macbeth's world, but in the world of actual fact, sought healing by the royal hand. The notion that kings possess the gift of healing belongs to primitive society. Sir James Frazer gives instances in the *Golden Bough*, and Tacitus recorded cures worked by Vespasian. The Arabians, too, believed that royal blood was a certain cure for hydrophobia and demoniacal possession. The belief in the royal power of healing the scrofulous may therefore be regarded as a survival of primitive thought. Professor Bloch holds that in France the Capetian kings from Robert the Pious onwards touched "persons" afflicted with sundry maladies, scrofula included. Later on, he thinks, the idea grew up that the royal touch could cure, not all diseases, but that prevalent and distressing disease which came to be known as *mal de roi, morbus regius*, or the king's evil. The first French king recorded as having cured such sufferers was Philip I. (1060-1108), the authority being a sentence in Guibert de Nogent's treatise, *De Pignoribus Sanctorum*. In England the royal touch began, according to the popular belief, with Edward the Confessor, but Professor Bloch shows conclusively that this is mere legend. Henry II. is the first English sovereign of whom it can be said on good contemporary evidence that he touched for the evil. But it is extremely probable that the practice began under Henry I. Whatever the dates at which the practice originated in France and England, the strength of the popular belief in both countries is unquestionable. When the ambassador of Edward III. sought to gain Venetian help for his master in the impending war with France, he proposed that Philip of Valois should essay the cure of the sick as proof of his right to the French throne. Sir John Fortescue, writing on behalf of Henry VI., denied that the rival King, Edward IV., possessed the gift of healing. The kings of France, after their coronation at Rheims, were wont to repair to Corbeny to perform a nine days' devotion at the shrine of St. Marculf and touch for the evil. Royal household accounts in France and in England furnish invaluable evidence as to the numbers who flocked to gain relief from suffering by the royal touch and receive alms from the royal purse. The accounts kept on wax

tablets by Renaud de Roye under Philip the Fair state the amount of the gifts bestowed on sufferers from the king's evil and likewise their names and places of abode. From all parts of France and even from Navarre, Lorraine, and Italy men and women journeyed in hope of healing, just as in the seventeenth century men came from Virginia and New Hampshire to be touched by Charles II. at Whitehall. The last sovereign to touch for the king's evil in France was Charles X. in 1825. In England the royal ceremonial had come to an end at the death of Queen Anne, though the exiled Stuarts had continued to touch numbers who regarded them as the rightful sovereigns, and believed in their power to heal. In Ireland as late as 1901 a handkerchief stained with the blood of Cardinal York was thought capable of curing the king's evil. But Hume, in 1755, had spoken of the "touch" as "a practice attended with ridicule in the eyes of all men of understanding." The belief in the miraculous powers of kings died through the change in both theological and political conceptions. In this belief it is difficult to see anything else than "the result of a collective error; an error less harmful, however, than most of these with which the story of the past is filled."

Royal household accounts are far from being the only class of records containing references to the king's evil. Parish registers often furnish entries, such as the following extract from the register of Harewood, Herefordshire, under date September 29, 1684: "This day made a certificate for Alice the daughter of Christopher Williams of this parish for the king's evil. My name and seale to it as minister, her father's as guardian." In the recently published *Extracts from the Records of the Borough of Leicester* (1603-88) is an entry (p. 248) among the Chamberlain's Accounts for 1627-28: "*Item* payed by the appoyntment of M^{r} Maior and the Aldermen unto —Callidis a poore widdowe of S^{t} Maries Parishe when she went to His Maiestie to seeke helpe for a child haveinge the Kings evill xs." The kindness of the Head Mistress of the Grey Coat Hospital, Westminster, supplies some interesting details. In 1708 Frances Young, who was admitted on July 19, having the measles and the king's evil, was returned to the overseers on July 24. An entry dated October 24 of the same year, after mentioning the death of a child on the previous day, continues thus: "Ordered that Mr. Ashenden (the first master) do deliver to the mother of the said child deceased the gold she did wear on account of the Evil."

When the mediæval kings of France sought to exercise their healing powers the words they used were: "Le roi te touche. Dieu te guérit." In later days, when the belief in

their powers was weakening, the words were slightly but significantly altered by the substitution of "guérisse" for "guérit." The favourite phrase of the great Huguenot surgeon, Ambroise Paré, was "Je le pansay et Dieu le guérist." The contrast between the last two formulæ shows the gulf between mediæval and modern conceptions. But Queen Elizabeth's Office of Healing contains a prayer which might be used in any hospital to-day: "Almighty God, the eternal health of all such as put their trust in Thee, hear us we beseech Thee on behalf of these Thy servants for whom we call for Thy merciful help, that they recovering health may give thanks to Thee in Thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL.

EUCHARISTIC ORIGINS.

IN October 1923 a summary of Professor Wetter's important book on the Eucharist* appeared in THEOLOGY. The thesis was, briefly, that the primitive Eucharist was a dramatic representation of the "Christian Mystery," that is, the Epiphany, Death and Resurrection of Christ the Saviour God. To this day the East retains many of the original ideas, but to a large extent there, and far more in the West, the main thought is now the offering to God of the bread and wine, changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, as the one offering pleasing to Him. In a second volume, now to be described, Professor Wetter discusses the Sacrifice of the Mass. His method is the same as before, to begin with fossils embedded in the present liturgies, phrases which would never have assumed their present form had they been composed for the position they now occupy, and which accordingly testify to an earlier stage of liturgical development. Having reached provisional conclusions with the help of the liturgies, he uses the non-liturgical evidence to corroborate them.

The opening chapter discusses the offering as it appears in the Eastern Liturgies. At an earlier stage it was an offering of gifts which were received by the deacons and presented on the altar by the priest. Intercessions were offered for those who brought the gifts and for those on whose behalf they were brought. In the present liturgies the original forms have been worked over, in the interests of the later theory of the Offering of Christ's Body and Blood, but enough remains to show the

* *Altchristliche Liturgien. I. Das Christliche Mysterium.* By G. P. Wetter (Professor at Upsala). Göttingen: Vanderhoek und Ruprecht. 1922.

primitive intention. The general tendency has been to bring the accompanying prayers forward from the Mass of the Faithful to the Preparation.

As a specimen of Wetter's arguments let us take the Abyssinian Liturgy; the other liturgies receive similar treatment. In the introductory section we find the following prayer (Brightman, p. 199).

"Lord our God, Who didst accept the offering of Abel in the wild and of Noah in the ark and of Abraham on the mountain top and of Elijah . . . David . . . and the widow's mite in the Sanctuary: accept likewise the oblation of Thy servant John which he has brought unto Thine holy name and let it be the redemption of his sins: recompense him with a goodly recompense in this world and in that which is to come both now and ever and world without end."

One New Testament offering is added to the Old Testament examples—the widow's mite. The oblation has already been made at the beginning of Mass. The offerer is mentioned by name, and recompense is expected both now and in the next world. The prayer is most inappropriate if taken to refer to the Sacrifice of the Mass, but eminently suited to the primitive idea of votive offerings. The parallel prayer in the Coptic Liturgy contains these words: "Remember, O Lord, those who have offered Thee these gifts and those for whom they have brought them and those through whom they have brought them: grant them all the recompense from heaven." In the Abyssinian Liturgy as elsewhere an offering of gifts by the faithful for definite purposes has become a priestly action. Later (Brightman, p. 203) tithes and firstfruits are mentioned among the oblations. In the actual Mass of the Faithful the thought of offering is completely absent with the exception of a passing reference at the end of the chief prayer: "Remembering His death and His resurrection, we confess Thee *and offer unto Thee this bread and this cup*, giving thanks unto Thee." The words in italics seem to be an addition.

Before leaving the East we quote an interesting passage from the Nestorian Liturgy (Brightman, p. 271 *f.*): "Pray for me, my brethren and my beloved, that I be accounted worthy to offer before our Lord Christ this sacrifice living and holy for myself and for all the body of the holy Church." In its present context this is the Sacrifice of the Mass. But originally it cannot have been, for how could Christ's Body and Blood be offered to Christ?

The Western liturgies show the custom of offering gifts even more plainly than the Eastern. It lasted well on into the Middle Ages and was only suppressed by the consistent policy

of Rome. The old prayers were partly suppressed, partly remodelled and put in other places.*

The custom of offering as it appears in non-liturgical sources, Western and Eastern, is now described. A striking example occurs in an *Ordo Romanus* of the ninth century, published by Duchesne.† After the reading of the Gospel the bishop rises from his seat to receive the offerings from the people, and the choir begin to sing the *offertorium*. The assistant ministers collect the bread and wine first from the men, then from the women. They wash their hands and proceed to separate from the gifts so much as is required for the Eucharist. Parallel accounts can be adduced from almost every province of the Western Church, though not in the official Roman masses. Jerome's witness is impressive for the fourth century. We see many "qui opprimunt per potentiam vel furta committunt, ut de multis parua pauperibus tribuant et in suis sceleribus glorientur, publiceque diaconus in ecclesiis recitet offerentium nomina, Tantum offert illa, Tantum ille pollicitus est, placentque sibi ad plausum populi."‡ This is borne out by a recent discovery§ of a Church at Aquileia, dating from the early fourth century.

The Eucharist was celebrated in a separate room. A barrier separated the sanctuary from the place of assembly; it was pierced by two doors, through one of which, probably, the offerers came with their gifts, retiring by the other. In the main room mosaics decorate the floor. In the middle is a Victory with crown and palm between a basket with bread and a great cup. Round it are depicted men and women carrying bread for the most part, but also grapes, flowers, and a bird. Clearly we have a representation of the Eucharist procession, at an early stage, when the laity brought their own gifts; later they gave them to the deacons who brought them to the altar. Remains of the simple wooden table in the middle of the inner room, upon which the gifts were laid, are still visible.

* A few passages may be quoted. From the Roman Mass (early MSS). "Memento, domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N. et omnium circumstantium quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota deuotio, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolumitatis suæ; tibi reddunt uota sua æterno deo et uiuo." As the offerers are mentioned by name and offer *uota*, the *sacrificium laudis* cannot originally have been the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Leonine Sacramentary. "Exsultantes domine cum muneribus ad altaria ueneranda concurrimus, quia et omnium nobis hodie summa uotorum et causa nostræ redemptionis exorta est" (Muratori, i., 763). "Ad altaria domine ueneranda *cum hostiis laudis* accedimus. Fac quæsumus ut et indulgentiam tuam nobis concilient et fauorem" (*Ibid.*, 681.). An old *Ordo* (Migne, *P.L.* cli. 886). "Sacerdos *oblationem accipiens* dicat: Suscipe sancta trinitas hanc oblationem, quam tibi offert famulus tuus, et præsta, ut in conspectum tuum tibi placens ascendat." The prayer has been remodelled, but the original rubric remains.

† *Christian Worship*, p. 459.

‡ *Comm. in Ezek.* 18 (Migne, *P.L.* xxv. 175), *cf. Ep.* 8.

§ First described in 1915. See Lietzmann in *Z.N.T.W.* (1921), p. 249 *f.*

Great importance was attached in early times to the offering taking place after catechumens etc. had withdrawn. Whoever was allowed to offer was naturally allowed to communicate. The custom is presupposed by the well-known anecdote in the Life of Gregory the Great (*Vita*, ii. 41); a woman doubted whether the oblation, which she had herself made, could be the Body of Christ.

M. Loisy contributes a fascinating account of a survival in France of the old custom. In his native village of Ambrières (Marne), as in all the surrounding district, up to about 1850, bread and wine were offered at funeral masses. This was confined to women, the men bringing money. The money went to the priest, the food to him, the choristers and the poor. His mother tells how her grandfather's shepherd used to bring a lamb to the altar for an offering at Christmas. The well-known custom of *pain bénit* is another survival. In country parishes the offering is made by the different households in turn. The choir boys solemnly bring it up, followed by the offerer (generally a girl), who bears a candle. The bread is cut up in the sacristy and distributed to the congregation, who eat it as a kind of sub-sacramental communion.*

Returning to the primitive Church, we find many illustrative passages in the African Fathers. A very clear example occurs in Cyprian's *De Opere et Eleem.*, 15. He blames a rich woman who thinks she can celebrate the Lord's Supper when she comes empty handed and partakes of the sacrifice offered by a poor person.

In the East the custom was suppressed at an early date, so fewer traces than in the West are to be expected. But some remain. See the Syriac *Didascalia* (ii. 36): "Offer ei (God) *sacrificia* ipsius assidue omni tempore, neque amovearis ab ecclesia, et cum acceperis *eucharistiam sacrificii*, omnia quæ in manus tuas ueniunt, mitte et communica cum peregrinis, haec enim episcopo collecta sunt ad peregrinos omnes sustentandos. Propterea quantum potes sepone ac prouide, quoniam dominus in lege dixit: non apparebis coram me vacuus." The conclusion is that gifts of every kind were offered. The Apostolic Canons mark a stage in the development by prescribing that only bread and wine shall be offered at the altar; other gifts are to be brought to the house of the bishop or presbyter.

The evidence of the first two centuries is unavoidably scanty. The materials are full of gaps and we must not expect to hear much about a feature of the *Missa Fidelium*. Irenæus is the

* This is the origin of the stories of Anglican and Protestant visitors being invited to communicate in France. Note how the primitive oblation and the Agape are associated with the Mass.

most important witness. "Giving directions to the disciples to offer to God the firstfruits of His own created things—not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said 'This is My body.' And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant; which the Church receiving from the apostles offers to God throughout all the world, to Him Who gives us as the means of subsistence the firstfruits of His own gifts in the New Testament. . . ." (iv. 17. 5). "The oblation of the Church . . . is accounted with God a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him, not that He stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but that he who offers is himself glorified in what he does offer, if his gift be accepted (Mt. v. 23, 24 is quoted—bringing a gift to the altar). We are bound therefore to offer to God the firstfruits of His creation" (iv. 18. 1). This passage clearly refers to the custom described above. "He who offers" is the layman, not the priest. However, to Irenæus the bread and wine were clearly the Body and Blood of Christ (iv. 18. 4*f.*). The character of the Eucharistic elements is ascribed to the gifts from which they are chosen. This is a transitional stage on the road to the complete doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If Irenæus is the chief witness, Justin Martyr, the Didache, and Clement corroborate the impression already gained.

In a final chapter, Professor Wetter draws together the threads of his discussion. There are no real heathen parallels to the complex of thoughts underlying the primitive Eucharist. It is definitely Christian and has two roots. The first is the presence of the Lord Whose death and resurrection are mystically represented,* the second is the offering of gifts to God. The moment the two are brought into relation, the Catholic Mass is there, and the bread and wine (chosen from the totality of gifts) are felt to be the Body and Blood of Christ. The offering was a moralization of the votive offerings and sacrifices of the ancient world. At a time when the lower classes felt the severest economic pressure, the substitution of the Christian feast, at which the offerings were not destroyed but put to good uses, for sacrifices was warmly welcomed.

The custom became very popular and threatened to drive out the "mystery," but the fusion of the two things saved the situation.† But the offering soon lost its pride of place; transferred to the preparatory part of the service it lasted a long

* This is fully discussed in Wetter's first volume.

† The Epiclesis was originally a blessing of the gifts, not a transforming of the elements. This is argued at length.

while. By way of compensation for the loss the bringing of the elements, and the selection of a part for use, *by the priest* assumed great solemnity. In the East it became a separate act preparatory to the service. Many a feature in existing liturgies is rightly understood as a primitive act of the laity now performed by the priest. The close of the second and the beginning of the third centuries seem to be the turning point in this development. The primitive Eucharistic meal was separated from the service and secularized. Deprived of its holy associations it developed abuses and was deservedly suppressed.*

W. K. L. Clarke.

NOTICES

Evolution, Knowledge and Revelation. By S. A. McDowall. Cambridge University Press. 6s. net.

To construct a theory of Knowledge based on the facts of Evolution and in sympathy with the spiritual interpretation of Nature, which is the essential characteristic not only of revealed religion but also of the best metaphysical systems, is no easy task. Dr. McDowall has prepared us for the attempt in a series of preliminary volumes which have attracted the notice of thinkers. These Hulsean lectures will repay careful study by those who are wrestling more particularly with the problem of Divine Revelation and its place in an idealistic philosophy.

H. M. Relton.

Education and Religion. Edited by E. A. Burroughs, Dean of Bristol. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s. net.

These lectures, delivered in Bristol Cathedral, aim at influencing public opinion upon the question of the place of religion in our educational system in the light of post-war experience.

The substance of the lectures endorses the Dean's verdict to the effect that the suppression or hampering of religious teaching is a crime against the very soul of education, and on purely educational grounds there is every reason for giving it rather pride of place; if the issue of national Religious Education is again to be re-opened in a new atmosphere, in a different spirit, and, as the Dean suggests, on what might be called a vaster plane, we agree as to the vital place religious teaching must have in any reconstruction. What the content and character of that teaching ought to be, in the opinion of these lecturers, readers may discover for themselves if they care to peruse this book.

H. M. Relton.

* *Cf. Conc. Laod.*, 28 (middle of fourth century). ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγομένας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀκούβιτα στρωννύειν. Does not this reference to the "so-called agapes" suggest that the name in the technical sense and therefore the thing were novelties?

INDEX OF VOLUME IX

JULY—DECEMBER, 1924

PAGE

ALLEGORY and Myth in Dante 206
Anglican Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, The First 265
Anima Christi 218
Are there Any Messianic Predictions ? 6
Auto-Suggestion 66
BAKER, A. E. 188
BAXTER, J. H. 229
BICKNELL, E. J. 290
Book Notes 58, 237, 298
Books Reviewed:
Acute and Chronic Unbelief. By A. C. Wyokoff 235
Book of the Lover and the Beloved. By Ramon Lull 177
British Contemporary Philosophy. Edited by J. H. Muirhead . . . 54
Cathedral Church of Hereford, The. By A. T. Bannister 112
Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity. By O. C. Quick . . 56
Children's Bible, The 122
Christ and the Critics. By H. Felder 238
Christ of the Testament, The. By P. E. More 239
Christian Child, The. By G. H. Doble 59
Christian Schools and Scholars. By F. R. Drane 298
Christian Ways of Salvation. By G. W. Richards 58
Christianity and Social Science. By C. A. Ellwood 58
Church Catechism. By E. B. Redlich 298
Church of England in India, The. By Bishop Eyre Chatterton . . . 44
Church Principles. By Carnegie Simpson 181
Confession, Le Sécret de la. By L. Honoré 238
Cosmology. By J. O'Neill 293
Decalogue, The. By Dr. Charles 349
Doctrine of the Infallible Book. By Bishop Gore 300
English Theologians 290
Eucharistic Origins. By G. P. Wetter 353
Five Centuries of Religion. By G. G. Coulton 229, 241
Ideals of Asceticism. By O. Hardman 111
Ideas of God in Israel. By Edward Pace 51
Interpretations New and Old. By A. S. Geden 299
Israel before Christ. By A. W. F. Blunt 239
King's Touch, The. By M. Bloch 352
Law of Moses, The. By Ed. Naville 59
Light of Russia, The. By D. A. Lowrie 298
Living Issues in Religious Thought. By H. G. Wood 58
Magic, History of. By Lynn Thorndike 232
Miroir de l'Ame. By Hembuche 234
New Testament of To-day. By E. F. Scott 295
Parish Church Architecture. By E. Tyrell Green 234
Pastoral Epistles. By W. Lock 221
Pentateuchal Criticism. By D. C. Simpson 296
Père Lallemant 108
Pharisaism and the Gospels. By I. Abrahams 117
Pharisees, The. By R. T. Herford 117
Question Time in Hyde Park. By C. F. Rogers 236
Reality in Bible Reading. By F. Ballard 240
Religion of a Layman, The. By C. R. Brown 237
Rois Thaumaturges, Les. By M. Bloch 350
ST. DAVID, Life of. By A. W. Wade Evans 180
St. Dominic, Life of. By Bede Jarrett 117
St. Joan. By Bernard Shaw 224
St. Thomas Aquinas 238
Seeing Life Whole. By H. C. King 58
Siège Apostolique. By P. Batiffol 284
Social Development. By L. T. Hobhouse 114
Songs of Sorrow and Praise. By D. Cameron 299
Spirit in the New Testament, The. By E. F. Scott 96
Three Religions of China, The. By W. E. Soothill 56
Universal Church, The. By T. A. Lacey 59
Upanishads, Philosophy of. By S. Radhakrishnan 237
Ursprung und Anfäuge des Christentums. By E. Meyer 127
Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus ? By D. S. Guy 234

Books Reviewed: PAGE
What is the English Use? By C. Dunlop 59
World of Souls, The. By W. Lutoslawski 55
BOYD, F. 277
BRIGHTMAN, F. E. 40
BRISCOE, J. F. 108
CARRINGTON, P. 315
Christian Mystery, The. II. 188
Church and Birmingham Conference, The 103
Church and Intellectual Unrest, The 14
Churchmanship of Dr. Johnson, The 332
CLARKE, W. K. L. 41, 95, 127, 215, 355
Communion under One Kind 78
Correspondence 33, 175, 281
DAVID, W. H. 97
DEWAR, L. 249
Divine Unity, The 246
Donne, John 149
Editorial 1, 61, 122, 241, 301
Elizabethan Pulpit, The 138
English Canon of 1549 259
Eucharistic Origins 355
FELTOE, C. L. 217
FOX, GEORGE 22
Gospel of Life, The 62, 183, 302
HARDY, T. J. 166
HENDERSON, A. 326
HODGKIN, L. V. 22
HODGSON, L. 83
HUDSON, C. E. 73
HURTLEY, W. H. 66
HUTTON, W. H. 169, 224
In the Study 41, 95, 215
Intercession 100
Invocation in the Holy Eucharist 33
KELLY, H. 197
KIDD, B. J. 284
KNIGHT, Bishop 341
KNOX, W. L. 14
KÖNIG, Professor 6
LA TROBE BATEMAN 100
LACEY, T. A. 146
Liturgica 217
LYTTELTON, E. 103
Miscellanea 32, 94, 175, 214, 270, 341
Moss, C. B. 265
Music in Worship 97
Nestorius, Problem of 83
Newman's "Fidus Achates" 166
Odes of Solomon, The 219, 346
Orientalia 281
Our Appeal to History 306
PERSHORE, Abbot of 177
Plea for a Single Revised Liturgy 1
PORTER, W. S. 138, 332
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T. 219, 344
Priest, The 197
Problem of Pentecost, The 249
Psycho-Analysis and the Faith 73
PULLER, F. W. 78, 270
Reservation of the Chalice 270
RICHMOND, Canon W. 62, 183, 302
RIPON, Bishop of 221
Sacred Fish, The 326
SELWYN, E. G. 1, 241, 280
STEWART, J. A. 206
Tradition of the Catechism, The 315
TURNER, Professor C. H. 306
TYRER, J. W. 259
Warnings from Roman Liturgiologists 341
WIGRAM, W. A. 281

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.